United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, JUNE 14, 2013 *No. 85*

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, June 17, 2013, at 2 p.m.

House of Representatives

FRIDAY, JUNE 14, 2013

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

God our Father, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

Bless the Members of the people's House as they gather at the end of another week in the Capitol. Endow each with the graces needed to attend to the issues of the day with wisdom, that the results of their efforts might benefit the citizens of our Nation and the world.

On this Flag Day, may we be reminded of the greatness of the democratic experiment that is the Republic of the United States and diligent in our responsibilities as citizens to guarantee the freedoms enumerated in the Constitution for all who claim this country as their home.

We also ask Your blessing leading into this weekend upon fathers throughout our country. May they be their best selves, and may their children appreciate fully the blessing their fathers have been to them.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. MATSUI led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

AL QAEDA TERRORIST THREAT GROWS

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, last Monday, I attended a briefing by the American Enterprise Institute concerning foreign policy issues. I particularly appreciated a presentation by Dr. Fred Kagan, an internationally recognized authority on terrorist threats to American families.

He provided a map, which I believe should be known by the American people, of the al Qaeda and associated movement areas of operation and safe havens. It is sad Somalia is ruled by warlords, Libya is controlled by militias, and in Mali, there are new reports of terrorists training with surface-to-air missiles. This war began with safe havens in Afghanistan on September 11, 2001.

I believe we should be proactive in working with our allies to stop terrorists overseas. We cannot wish the threat away because, in fact, threats are growing. We should support peace through strength by stopping terrorism overseas or face more attacks on the streets of America.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

STUDENT LOANS

(Mr. MATHESON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of access to higher education.

Satin Tashnizi is a freshman at the University of Utah, with aspirations of becoming a heart surgeon. As a first-generation American, Satin grew up watching both of her parents struggle to provide for her, working multiple jobs while going to school, continually reminding Satin that America is the land of opportunity.

Recently, I had the privilege of sitting down with Satin and several other college students to talk about their experiences paying for college and why it is critical that Congress come together to solve the current student loan debate.

As a high school student, Satin enrolled in several AP classes and graduated near the top of her class. She was accepted at her first college choice out of State; however, due to finances, Satin opted to stay in-State for school, hoping her family would have enough money to pay for medical school later on. But with interest rates on subsidized student loans set to double July 1, the chances that Satin's family can afford medical school are getting smaller.

We have 16 days to reach a compromise on this matter here in Congress to help ensure that all Americans have the opportunity to reach their educational dreams.

MENTAL HEALTH ASSESSMENTS

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today the House will be voting on the National Defense Authorization Act, known as the NDAA. The NDAA's purpose is to ensure that our brave sons and daughters who serve this country will have what they need to be trained and resourced to do their jobs effectively and safely.

This authorization is one of the few policy matters in Washington not viewed through a partisan lens. As a father of a son and daughter-in-law currently serving our country in Afghanistan, I'm proud to say that that is the case.

Today's NDAA includes an amendment I added that would mandate the Department of Defense implement a preliminary mental health assessment before individuals join the military. The goal is to assure mental health resiliency for those who will be facing the combat realities of war. The suicide rate among our military is unacceptable, and this amendment will help reduce it.

The Department of Defense has done medical assessments for many years. It is time we bring mental health to parity in preliminary assessments. We must focus on the overall well-being of the force.

CLIMATE CHANGE

(Ms. MATSUI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a member of the Safe Climate Caucus to highlight the four-part plan released last Monday by the International Energy Agency about the importance of reducing greenhouse gas emissions. It is yet one more report sounding the alarm that we are not on track to meet the agreed-upon target of limiting the rise of average global temperatures to 2 degrees Celsius.

Mr. Speaker, how many more reports must be released before we act? Every day that Congress continues down this self-destructive path of ignoring climate change is a missed opportunity to bring immense benefits to our country. By failing to enact responsible climate change policies, we are missing the opportunity to simultaneously create good paying jobs, protect our environment, and leave a sustainable planet for our future generations.

The time to act is now.

REINTRODUCTION OF THE JOBS ACT

(Mr. BROUN of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, there's a lot going on in our country right now, but we here in Congress need to remember that the number one priority remains getting our economy back on track. That's why, today, I reintroduced the original JOBS Act.

My JOBS Act would reduce the corporate tax rate and capital gains tax to zero. It would totally eliminate them. It would also extend for 3 years bonus depreciation and would allow 100 percent expensing for business assets. Finally, the JOBS Act would permanently repeal the estate and gift taxes—the death taxes.

My bill would give businesses the boost that they need to create more jobs. It would stimulate our economy and would bring manufacturing jobs back to America.

I urge my colleagues to support my JOBS Act.

THE BLACK FOREST FIRE

(Mr. LAMBORN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the many dedicated firefighters, first responders, and military personnel who are battling the ongoing Black Forest fire to save countless homes and lives in my congressional district. I would also like to recognize the coordinated response of all the Federal, State, and local resources that have come together to contain the fire.

Since erupting Tuesday afternoon, the Black Forest fire has, at this time, claimed two lives, destroyed 379 homes, and displaced over 41,000 people, making it the most destructive fire in Colorado history.

I will continue to do all I can to help the thousands of families displaced by this fire and ensure that our brave firefighters and first responders have all the Federal resources they need.

I ask all of you to keep the people of the Black Forest and the family of the two who have died in your thoughts and prayers during this tragedy.

ALBANIAN PRIME MINISTER BERISHA, AMERICA'S LOYAL FRIEND

(Mr. ROHRABACHER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, 20 years ago, Albania was struggling to leave behind its years of repression, dependence, and deprivation, a period when it was a North Korea clone. Now, Albania is a democracy with elected representatives who engage in open debates within a vigorous civil society.

Albania is a member of NATO that continues to contribute troops to the International Security Force in Afghanistan and participated in the U.S.-led liberation of Iraq, and it now aspires to have membership in the European Union.

In contrast to the atheist dictatorship it left behind, today, Albanian churches and mosques are full. Similarly, Marxist economics has been replaced with an expanding market economy. America needs to be especially grateful to the Government of Albania and to the Albanian Prime Minister, Sali Berisha, who has been a steadfast and courageous ally of the United States.

Recently, when the U.S. needed countries willing to provide asylum to members of the MEK now stranded in Iraq, Prime Minister Berisha agreed to accept 210 members of that group—far more than any other country. That was a sign of good faith and friendship for America. It will not soon be forgotten, and it took real courage on the part of President Berisha to make this generous offer. We will not forget his friendship.

□ 0910

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FORBES). Pursuant to House Resolution 260 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1960.

Will the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN) kindly resume the chair.

□ 0912

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1960) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2014 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, with Mr. HULTGREN (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose Thursday, June 13, 2013, the seventh set of en bloc amendments offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON) had been disposed of.

The Chair understands that amendment No. 18 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 19 OFFERED BY MRS. WALORSKI

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of June 13, 2013, it is now in order to consider amendment No. 19 printed in part B of House Report 113–108.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 405, after line 9, insert the following:

SEC. 1040B. PROHIBITION ON TRANSFER OR RELEASE OF INDIVIDUALS DETAINED AT GUANTANAMO TO YEMEN.

None of the amounts authorized to be available to the Department of Defense may be used to transfer, release, or assist in the transfer or release, during the period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act and ending on December 31, 2014, any individual detained at Guantanamo (as such term is defined in section 1033(f)(2)) to the custody or control of the Republic of Yemen or any entity within Yemen.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Indiana.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Chairman, in May, the President declared a renewed intention to transfer detainees from Guantanamo ''to the greatest extent possible.'' He also announced he was lifting his self-imposed suspension on the transfers of detainees to Yemen.

This, I believe, is a dangerous policy. It is dangerous for our troops fighting overseas. It is also dangerous for citizens living in the homeland.

The amendment I am offering prohibits the Department of Defense from transferring Gitmo detainees to Yemen for one year. In other words, this amendment simply puts into the law the President's previous judgment that transfers to Yemen should be suspended.

Those listening to the debate today might be asking: ''Why is this prohibition needed?'' For starters, the Defense Department should not transfer detainees to Yemen because they represent some of the most dangerous terrorists known in the world.

It is important to note that these individuals are still in Gitmo because even the Obama administration believes they are being legally held. The Bush administration didn't feel comfortable transferring these terrorists. After Yemen was the starting point for the foiled airline bombing over Detroit, the Obama administration correctly decided not to transfer these terrorists back to that troubled nation.

These individuals pose a real threat to the United States. Detainees at Gitmo pose a real threat to our national security. Transfers to Yemen should be prohibited because Yemen has become a hotbed for terrorist activity. In fact, al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula—which is widely believed to be the most lethal of all al Qaeda affiliates—is based in Yemen.

Director of National Intelligence James Clapper testified in 2011 that AQAP remains the affiliate most likely to conduct a transnational attack. This is an organization with which we are at war, an organization that is resolute on killing as many Americans as they can if we don't stop them first.

It makes no sense to send terrorists to a country where there is an active al Qaeda network that we know has been engaged in targeting the U.S. The Christmas Day Detroit bombing attempt, the ink cartridge bomb plot, and the radicalization of the Fort Hood shooter all can be traced back to Yemen.

Let's look at the facts. We should not be in the business of sending Gitmo detainees to Yemen because, one, they represent some of the most dangerous terrorists in the world and, two, Yemen is home of the most active al Qaeda affiliate, and lastly, because Yemen has a poor track record of securing its prisons.

A Yemen citizen, the convicted mastermind of the USS *Cole* bombing who took the lives of 17 American sailors, was being held by Yemeni authorities when he escaped from prison in 2003. Luckily, he was recaptured, but he was able to escape again from Yemeni custody in 2006 along with 22 other terrorists.

Why risk another jailbreak by people who intend to do us harm? This is a commonsense amendment with the purpose of protecting Americans.

My amendment does not say the President can't transfer detainees elsewhere. My amendment is only in effect for 1 year to give Yemen time to demonstrate it can safely and securely handle Gitmo transfers.

Before taking additional steps, I also believe it is prudent that Congress receive the Department of Defense's report on factors that contribute to reengagement so that informed choices about future transfers can be made. This report is mandated by law, and it is currently overdue.

In closing, I want to share a statistic from the Office of the Director of National Intelligence. In 2012, ODNI reported that the combined suspected and confirmed re-engagement rate of former Gitmo detainees has risen to an alarming 27.9 percent. When I speak with constituents—moms and dads—back home who ask me how safe we really are, this rate of re-engagement comes to mind.

I ask my colleagues to consider the national security implications of transferring detainees to Yemen, and join me in support of my amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to the amendment.

The ACTING CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The 56 inmates that we are talking about at Guantanamo are not the most dangerous terrorists in the world. In fact, the intel community and the Department of Defense determined they were acceptable risks for release back to Yemen, back to their home country. Not everybody that we rounded up and took to Guantanamo, unfortunately, turned out to be the very, very dangerous terrorists that we thought they were.

The problem we confront with these 56 that we've determined are not a grave threat to the country, determining that if there is any minimal threat whatsoever we are simply going to hold them forever is, well, quite frankly, un-American. That is contrary to our values, to say that we are going to hold somebody indefinitely—I gather forever—because we think there might possibly be some risk. That's not the way the Constitution is supposed to work.

More than anything, this amendment restricts the President's flexibility. If the President determines that this is safe, if the intelligence community determines this is safe, if the Defense Department determines this is safe, they ought to have that option. This amendment takes that option away and, once again, makes Gitmo the classic Hotel California: ''You can check in any time you want, but you can never leave.''

We cannot warehouse people forever. We need to give the President options, not restrict them.

There are certification requirements that will always be in place to make sure that the Secretary of Defense, before releasing these people, certifies that he believes it is an acceptable risk. We will have to have that. But I think an absolute prohibition ties the hands of the President in an unhelpful way.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON).

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentlelady from Indiana for her effort on this very important amendment. For 4-plus years, the Obama administration has declined to transfer these terrorists at Guantanamo to Yemen. I would suggest that nothing has changed, if you look at the facts of the matter.

□ 0920

Yemen remains a partner in our war on terror, but it still has weak capabilities. It still has not yet demonstrated the ability to house such terrorists or to deter terrorist activity in its own quarters as we've seen from things like the underwear bombing plot or the Fort Hood massacre. If we transfer these terrorists to Yemen, we cannot know for sure that it will not mean more attacks on our soldiers in Afghanistan, on our Ambassadors at our Embassies around the world, on our citizens around the world, here in the United States, or in allied countries.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this temporary and

restrained amendment to ensure that terrorists at Guantanamo Bay do not escape back onto the battlefronts of the war on terror.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

(Mr. ANDREWS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend for yielding.

There is more agreement here than meets the eye. I think everyone in this Chamber agrees that no person who is a dangerous threat to the people of the United States should be released. I think most people in this Chamber agree that, if the Government of Yemen is unprepared to effectuate adequate security means, then no person should be released to Yemen.

The question here is who gets to make that decision. In this instance, the people who know the most about this—the leaders of our intelligence community, of our military, of our law enforcement community—have reviewed the specific details of 56 cases, and they have concluded based upon their review of those details that the right thing to do is to release these detainees to Yemen if and when they are satisfied that Yemen's security measures are appropriate.

The question here really comes down to whether this judgment should be made by the Members of this body, who have varying degrees of knowledge about this issue—including the gentlelady, who has very diligently learned a lot about this issue and cares a lot about it—or whether the decision should be made by people whom we have entrusted with the defense of our country, who have developed specific, granular, factual expertise about this question. I believe this is a case where the proper decision belongs with those experts, where the proper decision belongs with those who know the most about this matter. Rigidly limiting the options of those experts is a mistake.

So, although I believe we share the same intentions here, we don't share the same view of this amendment. I believe that the decision should be made by those best positioned to make it. If and when they determine that security conditions in Yemen are appropriate, then the decision to release should be made. In my view, that's the right process. I urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield myself the balance of my time just to say that I completely agree with the arguments of the gentleman from New Jersey.

It's not a question of whether or not these people should be released. It's a question of who should make that decision. Should Congress make that decision and restrict the President? restrict the intelligence community? restrict the Department of Defense? As the gentleman from Arkansas pointed out, Yemen has been a very capable and helpful partner in the war against al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula.

I believe these decisions are best left to the experts and not to have Congress restrict them and limit their options. With that, I urge opposition to the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Indiana will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF WASHINGTON

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of June 13, 2013, it is now in order to consider amendment No. 20 printed in part B of House Report 113–108.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike sections 1032, 1033, and 1034.

Page 399, line 9, strike ''120 days'' and insert ''60 days''.

Page 402, lines 6 through 7, strike ''90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense'' and insert ''30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President''.

Page 402, lines 8 through 9, strike ''of the Department of Defense''.

Page 402, line 10, after ''principal responsibility'' insert the following: '', in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Attorney General, and the intelligence community (under the meaning given such term section 3(4) of the National Security 18 Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4)),''.

Page 402, line 12, after ''Cuba'' insert the following: '', and the closure of the detention facility at such Naval Station''.

Page 402, line 14, after ''transfers'' insert the following: ''and such closure''.

Page 403, line 5, strike ''120 days'' and insert ''60 days''.

Page 403, line 20, strike ''120 days'' and insert ''60 days''.

Page 404, line 24, strike ''90 days'' and insert ''60 days''.

Page 405, after line 9, insert the following:

SEC. 1040B. GUANTANAMO BAY DETENTION FACILITY CLOSURE ACT OF 2013.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Guantanamo Bay Detention Facility Closure Act of 2013''.

(b) USE OF FUNDS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, amounts authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available to the Department of Defense may be used to—

(1) construct or modify any facility in the United States, its territories, or possessions to house any individual detained at Guantanamo for the purposes of detention or imprisonment;

(2) transfer, release, or assist in the transfer or release to or within the United States, its territories, or possessions an individual detained at Guantanamo; or

(3) transfer an individual detained at Guantanamo to the custody or control of the individual's country of origin, any other foreign country, or any other foreign entity.

(c) NOTICE TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 30 days before transferring any individual detained at Guantanamo to the United States, its territories, or possessions, or to a foreign country or entity, the President shall submit to Congress a report about such individual that includes—

(1) notice of the proposed transfer; and

(2) the assessment of the Secretary of Defense and the intelligence community (under the meaning given such term section 3(4) of the National Security 18 Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4)) of available evidence relating to the threat posed by the individual, any security concerns about the individual, the likelihood that the individual will engage in recidivism, and humanitarian concerns about the individual, including—

(A) the likelihood the detainee will resume terrorist activity if transferred or released;

(B) the likelihood the detainee will reestablish ties with al-Qaeda, the Taliban, or associated forces that are engaged in hostilities against the United States or its coalition partners if transferred or released;

(C) the likelihood of family, tribal, or government rehabilitation or support for the detainee if transferred or released;

(D) the likelihood the detainee may be subject to trial by military commission; and

(E) any law enforcement interest in the detainee.

(d) PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS.—No amounts authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Defense may be used after December 31, 2014, for the detention facility or detention operations at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

(e) PERIODIC REVIEW BOARDS.—The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that each periodic review board established pursuant to Executive Order No. 13567 or section 1023 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81; 125 Stat. 1564; 10 U.S.C. 801 note) is completed by not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(f) INDIVIDUAL DETAINED AT GUANTANAMO.—In this section, the term ''individual detained at Guantanamo'' means any individual located at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, as of October 1, 2009, who—

(1) is not a citizen of the United States or a member of the Armed Forces of the United States; and

(2) is—

(A) in the custody or under the control of the Department of Defense; or

(B) otherwise under detention at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

In section 2901, strike subsections (a), (b), and (c).

Page 646, lines 11 and 12, strike ''120 days'' and insert ''60 days''.

Page 648, after line 5, insert the following:

(F) The estimated security costs associated with trying such individuals in courts established under Article III of the Constitution or in military commissions conducted in the United States, including the costs of military personnel, civilian personnel, and contractors associated with the prosecution at such location, including any costs likely to be incurred by other Federal departments or agencies, or State or local governments.

(G) A plan developed by the Attorney General, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, the Director of National Intelligence, and the heads of other relevant departments and agencies,

identifying a disposition, other than continued detention at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, for each individual detained at such Naval Station as of the date of the enactment of this Act who is designated for prosecution. Such a disposition may include transfer to the United States for trial or detention pursuant to the law of war, transfer to a foreign country for prosecution, or release.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield myself 3 minutes.

This is a very straightforward amendment that simply asks the President to put together a plan to close Guantanamo Bay.

One of the complaints in recent weeks is that we've seen Guantanamo become more and more untenable. It continues to be an international eyesore. Way back in 2007, President George W. Bush said it should be closed. Then-candidate JOHN MCCAIN said it should be closed. As recently as last week, Senator MCCAIN and some other Senators went down and reached that conclusion as well. I think a justifiable criticism of that has come from the other side of the aisle that said, well, you can't close it unless you've got a plan for what to do with the inmates and a plan for how to close it, and that is exactly what this amendment does.

It requires the President within 60 days to come up with a plan for closing Guantanamo Bay prison, and then it also removes all of the restrictions that are in this bill that would stop him from generating that plan.

The bottom line is that we do not need Guantanamo. Guantanamo was set up in the first place in the hopes that, because it wasn't actually on American soil, we could somehow hold people outside the normal bounds of due process and the Constitution, but the Court ruled otherwise. The Court ruled that habeas does apply because Guantanamo is effectively under the control of the United States. So there is no benefit there. There are no greater rights in the U.S. than there are in Guantanamo. We just continue to have this prison that has been set up in a way that the international community cannot stand, and it makes a problem for us in terms of being able to cooperate with our allies and to have the ability to get that cooperation to properly prosecute the war on terror.

So I am simply asking that we put a plan in place so that we can close Guantanamo Bay once and for all—something that Republicans and Democrats alike have said that they've wanted to do. We simply haven't taken the steps necessary.

The prison is becoming very, very expensive. There is $250 million in MilCon contained in this bill just to keep it at a somewhat temporary status. Beyond that, the prospect of the United States' simply warehousing 166 people forever with no end in sight is contrary, again, I think, to our values and to our process.

I really want to emphasize the fact that we have here in the United States well over 300 terrorists incarcerated. There is a notion that somehow we couldn't possibly accommodate them here because of the threat, but we have Ramzi Yousef, and we have the Blind Sheikh. We have some of the most notorious terrorists in the world housed here already safely and securely. That is simply not an argument against doing this. The temporary facilities down at Guantanamo are not sustainable.

Now, I'm not going to rush this and say we've got to close it tomorrow if we don't have a plan. I'm simply requiring the President to come up with that plan, and then am giving him the legislative freedom to develop that plan as what we've done in this bill far too often is to have restricted that.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MCKEON. I yield 2 minutes to my friend and colleague, the chairman of the Seapower Subcommittee on the Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. FORBES).

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, on May 28, 2010, I stood on this floor and made a motion that effectively stopped some of the worst terrorists in the world at Guantanamo Bay from being transferred to the soil in the United States. At that particular point in time, the then-chairman of the Armed Services Committee, Democrat Ike Skelton, stood on the floor and said this:

> We are in a position to accept this motion. I just wish to point out that there is no difference between the Democrats and Republicans when it comes to fighting terrorism.

Today, we step on a course with this amendment to change that as the highest ranking Democrat on the Armed Services Committee seeks to overturn, essentially, that motion.

Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman were asking that these terrorists be brought to his district, that would be one thing, but he knows that's very unlikely. What you're having with this motion is very generously saying that they could be brought to any of our districts. We are hearing a uniform chorus stand up from North Carolina, Virginia, Guam, and every other place, saying, Don't bring them to my district.

The reason is they know two things: they know the moment they touch U.S. soil they will receive additional constitutional rights that no one in this room can argue what they are exactly; secondly, they have placed a target on every elementary school, on every shopping mall, on every small business in that district by other terrorists.

□ 0930

That's why, Mr. Chairman, it's important that we come together unified and send a message to the President that we might not be able to stop every terrorist from coming to U.S. soil, but we can stop these terrorists by defeating this amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Smith-Moran-Nadler amendment, which provides a six-part plan for closing Gitmo.

The amendment will remove the existing limitations on transfers, strike the current requests for construction at Gitmo, and end funding for the facility on December 31, 2014.

The time to close Guantanamo is now. It is a stain on our national honor. We are holding 166 people at Gitmo, 86 of whom have been cleared for release, that is to say they have been found guilty of nothing and judged not to pose any danger. There is no reason and no right for us to hold them further.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder which of our colleagues doesn't believe in the American system of justice. I wonder which one of us does not trust our own American court. I wonder who among us does not believe in the Bill of Rights, who does not believe in the right to counsel or that people should be presumed innocent until proven guilty. What we have at Gitmo is a system that is an affront to those beliefs and to America.

In the last decade, we have begun to let go of our freedoms bit by bit with each new executive order, each new court decision and, yes, each new act of Congress. We have begun giving away our rights to privacy, a right to our day in court when the government harms us; and with this legislation, we are continuing down the path of destroying the right to be free from imprisonment without due process of law.

I want to commend the gentleman from Washington and the gentleman from Virginia for fighting to close the detention facility at Guantanamo.

The language in this bill without our amendment prohibits moving any detainees into the United States and guarantees that we will continue holding people indefinitely, people who are not necessarily terrorists and who we only suspect to be terrorists and have not had a day in court to prove they are or are not terrorists. We will continue to hold them indefinitely without charge, contrary to every tradition this country stands for, contrary to due process and civil rights.

Because of this momentous challenge to the founding principles of the United States, that no person may be deprived of liberty without due process of law—and certainly not indefinitely without due process of law—we must close the detention facilitate at Gitmo now in order to restore our national honor.

They will have no additional constitutional rights. The Supreme Court ruled that they have the same constitutional rights at Guantanamo as they do here.

We must close this facility and restore our national honor. Support this amendment.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, Dr. WENSTRUP.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Chairman, the Guantanamo Bay detention facility was established to hold unlawful enemy combatants captured during the war on terror.

Any proposal to close the Guantanamo detention facility must first clearly address the transfer of remaining prisoners detained there. Many of the remaining detainees are the most hardened terrorists, including those responsible for the 9/11 mass murders of many Americans.

There are three primary options: transfer to another country or transfer to the United States or stay put.

Transferring these terrorists to another country comes with a substantial risk of reengaging as an American threat. The current reengagement rate of former Guantanamo detainees is nearly 28 percent.

I served for 1 year in Iraq with the Army as a medical officer at one of the largest detention facilities there. Often after prison release deals made by entrusted decisionmakers, we saw the same people return for new offenses. Additionally, there were multiple escapes and attempted escapes, as well as attacks trying to free the detainees.

I've been to Guantanamo, and the facilities there are a safe and secure location away from our soldiers on the battlefield. I don't think there are many people in Cuba that are trying to free the people that are held at Guantanamo, and this was not the case in Iraq, and it may not be the case should they be transferred to the United States.

I believe the prisoners at Guantanamo Bay are being treated appropriately and in a way that we can be proud of as a Nation. The hunger strike policy is carried out humanely with the detainees treated as patients. The access to caregivers and medical facilities is the same for our troops as it is for those detained.

Additionally, transfers to the United States would be very expensive. We've already built a courtroom there that cost us in the millions of dollars.

These terrorist detainees pose a very real danger to our security in America. They mean us real harm. The President has the ability to certify transfers of detainees to other countries, but he has yet to do so. And until the President leads with a better solution, I firmly believe that keeping Guantanamo open is our best option, our safest option, and our most logical option.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

(Mr. ANDREWS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend for yielding.

First, let me say that I think we all agree that our servicemembers who served us at Guantanamo have done a tremendous job and have brought great honor to our country. We thank and respect all of them.

I also believe that there is unanimity here that if someone is a credible threat to the United States, they should be detained, tried, and brought to justice. The question is where to do that.

Why should it be Guantanamo? Do defendants have greater rights if they are transferred from Guantanamo to a place in the United States? The Supreme Court has said, no, they don't. So there's no tactical advantage in a trial.

Are they more likely to escape if they're transferred to the United States? History says ''no.'' The number of escapes from maximum prisons, the supermax prisons, in the United States has been zero.

Is it less expensive to hold them at Guantanamo? Most certainly not. The average cost of incarcerating someone in a Federal maximum security supermax prison is $34,000 a year. The cost to the taxpayer of incarcerating someone at Guantanamo is over $1.6 million a year.

Is there some strategic advantage globally to holding these detainees at Guantanamo? The opposite is true. General Petraeus, Admiral Mullen, other leaders of our intelligence and military forces have said that Guantanamo is the best recruiting device against the United States, around the world for those who are trying to sell the lie that the United States is an inhumane and unjust place.

There is simply no rationale for an indefinite extension of the problem at Guantanamo. For reasons of security, for reasons of law, for reasons of cost, for reasons of strategic advantage, we should close Guantanamo Bay. That's why I support the Smith amendment.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON).

Mr. COTTON. I oppose this amendment. I oppose the closure of Guantanamo and the transfer of detainees to the United States.

Guantanamo is a state-of-the-art detention facility in which we've invested millions of dollars in which our troops handle themselves with utmost professionalism.

The detainees there have access to military tribunals and habeas corpus proceedings here in Washington, D.C.

Who are these detainees? They're not innocent goat herders swept up by a marauding United States military of which I was a part in which I detained numerous potential terrorists. They are people like Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, the mastermind of 9/11; Mohammed al-Qahtani, one of the would-be participants in 9/11; terrorists who are closely associated with Osama bin Laden who have received explosives training, who are recruiters, who are poison experts, who are suicide bombers or who are commanders of al Qaeda training camps. I do not think we should bring them to the United States, give them their Miranda warnings, give them an attorney at taxpayer-provided expense and if acquitted and not accepted by their home countries be released back onto the streets of the United States.

If that is what the advocates of this amendment would like, I suggest they should write their amendment in a fashion that would bring these detainees to their own congressional districts.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, you can pretty much win any battle you want to fight with superior military might. But for wars of consequence, you have to be fighting from the high ground consistently. That's what this amendment is all about.

We will win this war against violent extremism; but in order to do so, we have to win over the hearts and the minds of hundreds of millions of Muslims around the world who want what we have. They want equal justice under the law. They want fairness and truth and transparency and democracy.

The vast majority are young, idealistic, and very impressionable; and, unfortunately, too many of them are misled and manipulated.

□ 0940

We have a superior set of values and principles. It's what defines us as a Nation. But we have to hold steadfast to those values and principles. We have to show that even when we are challenged, even when it's politically difficult, we believe in equal justice under the law. We believe that people are innocent until proven guilty. We believe that every life matters. We believe in human rights, we don't believe in torture. But we do believe in our justice system. It's not our justice system that's operational at Guantanamo. It was set up there to be outside our justice system so we could detain people indefinitely.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. MORAN. At this time in our history when we're furloughing 650,000 Department of Defense employees, how can we justify spending $1.5 million per detainee at Guantanamo when half of them have been cleared for release? It doesn't make sense. And now in this bill we're authorizing another quarter of a billion dollars to be spent at Guantanamo. Those are misguided priorities. It costs $34,000 to jail very dangerous terrorists in this country, but in this country, we can convict them.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. POMPEO).

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chairman, I thank you.

There are a few facts that I think are appropriate to bring to this debate. I oppose this amendment vigorously. Just 2 weeks ago I was down at Guantanamo Bay on a trip that was part of the House Select Committee on Intelligence. I will tell you that the soldiers and marines and airmen of Joint Task Force Gitmo are taking tremendous care of the facilities, our assets and the detainees.

Those who suggest that this facility should go away will create a problem that is worse than the one that we have today. This amendment is simply a pattern of appeasement that does not comport with the fact that radical Islamic terrorists will not cease to attack us simply because we wish they would go away.

A few more facts. If we close Guantanamo Bay, we try to release them to countries that will accept them, we know that at least a quarter of them will return to the battlefield. We could bring them back to the United States, where they'd go to civilian courts, and undoubtedly some of them would end up walking the streets of the United States.

One of the final facts, and one that I've heard said in support of this amendment, is that if we simply close this facility that recruiting for radical extremists will diminish. This seems illogical. There's no support for such a statement. They will continue to attack us whether we keep this open or closed. This facility is legal, it's just, and it is an important national asset.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

A whole bunch of false arguments are being laid out here. As has been clear, no greater constitutional rights come to people in the United States than at Guantanamo. So that's just a phony argument.

The second phony argument is that somehow they can't be held safely. I have a Federal prison in my district. I have an INS detention facility in my district. Frankly, if there was a supermax facility in my district, I would not have a problem with them coming to that district. They should be held. I would hope that all of our supermax facilities, which are holding very, very dangerous people, they better be holding them securely right now.

It's $1.5 million a year versus $34,000. It is an absolute recruitment tool for al Qaeda. Our military leaders—General Petraeus—have all said that this is something that is harmful to U.S. security.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCKEON. I yield 2 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY), the vice chairman of the HASC Committee.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, cost is a red herring argument here. Does it cost more to keep a detainee in Guantanamo than a Federal prisoner here? Probably, but nothing like the figures that have been repeatedly cited on the other side. For example, if you look back at the fiscal year '11 Department of Justice budget request for moving the detainees to the U.S., it ends up in the first year being about $1.9 million per detainee, and about $500,000 per detainee in recurring costs.

On the other side of it, even the President, in a speech at the National Defense University, said it is less than a million dollars per prisoner now on detainee. Is there a difference? Sure. Is it anything like what we've been hearing? No.

And the rest of the story is: under the Geneva Convention, if you're holding somebody under the laws of war, you cannot put them with Federal prisoners even in a supermax prison. They have to be segregated. So those costs of bringing them here are higher.

But that's not really the issue here. The issue is what is the best thing to do to secure the country and to deal with the terrorist threat. And I just remind everybody, the ban on closing Guantanamo is not permanent. We have to reapprove it every year. So if the President actually comes up with a real plan, not just a speech, but a real plan to close Guantanamo and then deal with the detainees, then that ban can go away. But you can't say okay, we're going to remove all of the restrictions and we're going to close Guantanamo, and then we're going to figure out what we're going to do with these people, and that's exactly what this amendment does. The gentleman from Washington says it just asks for a plan. The underlying bill just asks for a plan. His amendment, in addition to asking for a plan, removes all of the existing restrictions. And on page 4, subsection (D), says specifically:

No funds shall be used there to detain people after December 31, 2014.

We've got to get the plan first before it closes. I think this amendment should be rejected.

Mr. MCKEON. How much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California has 2¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. MCKEON. I yield myself the balance of my time.

I strongly oppose this amendment. Two-and-a-half years ago I sent the President a letter about these important issues. I said in that letter:

I fully recognize the importance of crafting a careful and comprehensive framework for the detention of terrorists who wish to harm the United States. I also recognize the challenges and legal complexities related to such an endeavor. This appreciation is why this issue is simply too important for the administration to address on its own.

The President did not take up my offer at that time. Nearly a year later in another unanswered letter, I wrote:

While I remain open to working together, I am very disappointed that the administration has frequently shown a greater willingness to engage with international institutions, foreign governments, and the media on issues relating to our national security than it has with the U.S. House of Representatives.

Those are excerpts from two of the five letters that I've written to the President on this issue, which he has not answered. Yet, he still has not come forward with a proposal of oversight or any plan. What to do with Guantanamo is secondary to the President coming forward with a comprehensive plan. Such a plan must include what he proposes to do with those terrorist detainees who are too dangerous to release but cannot be tried.

Number two, how he will ensure terrorists transferred overseas do not return to the fight?

Three, what he will do with the terrorists we capture in the future; specifically, how will he prioritize intelligence questioning?

Finally, what he will do with the high-value terrorists still held in Afghanistan? This is a particularly critical priority for me. There are several extremely dangerous individuals still in custody in Afghanistan. The only option that I see, as completely unacceptable for those detainees, is to allow their release. We've already seen the outcome of making this tragic mistake in Iraq.

While I appreciate the proposed efficiency of my friend and colleague, Ranking Member SMITH's amendment, we cannot strike all prohibitions on transfers of Gitmo detainees, agree to bring them to the United States, release them overseas, and end all funding for Gitmo with absolutely any confidence that any of this will be handled in a way that best protects our national security.

Lastly, and this is important, I want to say that I'm proud of the men and women in uniform who serve our Nation every day at Guantanamo. It's not an easy duty. We owed them a debt of gratitude for their critical service to this Nation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington will be postponed.

□ 0950

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of June 13, 2013, it is now in order to consider amendment No. 14 printed in part B of House Report 113–108.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title V, add the following new section:

SEC. 502. EXPANSION OF CHAPLAIN CORPS.

The Secretary of Defense shall provide for the appointment, as officers in the Chaplain Corps of the Armed Forces, of persons who are certified or ordained by non-theistic organizations and institutions, such as humanist, ethical culturalist, or atheist.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, it's a very simple amendment. We, through our Chaplaincy Corps, need to support, and do support, various faith and philosophical beliefs among the men and women who bravely serve our country.

We already support some nontheistic beliefs. For instance, we have Buddhist chaplains. Buddhism is a nontheistic faith tradition.

And what my amendment would simply do is allow chaplains who are certified or ordained as secular humanists and ethical culturists or atheists to also be able to support the brave American and women who serve in our military.

Roughly 23 percent of the men and women in our Armed Forces either have no religion, or are atheists; but there are no chaplains that currently are able to represent this important and growing demographic.

Under current law, the Armed Forces only allow chaplains who are granted an endorsement by an approved religious organization and have received a graduate degree in theological or religious studies, precluding many of the seminaries and other institutions that can provide certification to nonreligious chaplains that could provide much-needed services, particularly to the roughly quarter of our servicemembers who have stated that they have no religious beliefs or are atheists.

There's no reason why the only faith tradition and philosophical tradition in our military without chaplains does not have any kind of support to address their health concerns.

Now, I've heard some say that, well, all members of our military, even those who are non-observers, are able to see psychiatrists or counselors for support. But that's a very different need than the spiritual needs and the philosophical needs that people have.

First of all, when someone sees a psychiatrist or counselor, it has a certain stigma that can be attached to it that doesn't exist when you're seeing a chaplain. It also doesn't enjoy the same confidentiality that a chaplain visit does, and the information discussed with a therapist can actually have an impact on the chain of command in terms of negatively impacting the servicemember's future military career.

So, again, the groundwork has already been laid with regard to nontheistic faiths like Buddhism, where we have active chaplains in our military. Many universities already have secular humanist chaplains, these including American University here in Washington, D.C. Other militaries have this as well. Our allied militaries in Belgium and the Netherlands have humanist chaplaincies.

And, again, it's a very simple concept and, I think, something that is long overdue to ensure that all members of the military, regardless of their faith background, whether they're believers or not, whatever their philosophy is in life, they have access to the chaplaincy to support their spiritual needs. And, of course, nonbelievers have spiritual needs just as believers do.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCKEON. At this time, Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana (Dr. FLEMING).

Mr. FLEMING. I thank the chairman for the opportunity to speak on this important issue.

Mr. Chairman, let's examine what a chaplain really is. A chaplain is a person who is a minister of the faith, someone who ministers on the basis of a belief in a deity, a higher power, who is associated with or attached to a secular organization.

An example, right here in this House, each morning begins, each legislative day, begins with a prayer from our chaplain.

Back home, the hospital that I'm associated with, Mennen Medical Center, my good friend, a Baptist pastor, is chaplain of our hospital. And so this goes to the core of the discussion.

A chaplain is a person who is a man or woman of the faith, of conscience, of spirituality, who ministers to those with respect to a secular organization.

I just heard the gentleman say that, well, we need atheist chaplains—which, to me, is an oxymoron—we need atheist chaplains to minister to the spiritual needs of soldiers.

Well, by definition, as an atheist, he doesn't or she doesn't believe in a spiritual world. Makes no sense whatsoever.

Mr. Chairman, the courts have affirmed that chaplains are mandated by the Constitution to enable military personnel to exercise faith according to their conscience. Nontheistic chaplains, by definition, cannot assist others in worship.

For any concerns my colleague from Colorado may have as to the nonspiritual needs of servicemen and -women who do not hold any sort of faith, I would submit that the military has resources readily available. Counselors, psychologists, and social workers are happy to meet those needs.

I would also note that current chaplains will serve with respect to any servicemember, religious, nonreligious, nontheistic, atheistic or agnostic alike who comes to them, providing these brave men and women with any resources they might need in their service to the Nation. So we have chaplains and secular advisers who can help anybody who claims to be or wants to be an atheist.

Chaplains come to the military via the Department of Defense-recognized faith groups, very important. Faith groups. It would be impossible for an individual who does not belong to any faith group to receive an endorsement, much in the same way that atheists have long insisted that they are not, in fact, a faith group and would thus be implausible that they would serve as a chaplain in the military.

Mr. Chairman, General George Washington founded our Chaplain Corps on July 29, 1775, to make sure that the Continental Army could have worship services.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCKEON. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. FLEMING. Just in summary, I would like to say this, Mr. Chairman. The saddest thing I could ever imagine is someone standing over a dying man or woman from combat and saying to them, there is no hope. If you die, there is no world, there is no life thereafter. That is the saddest thing I could ever imagine.

Mr. POLIS. Before further yielding, I yield myself 15 seconds just to say I think we're seeing a double standard here where, if it's a person of particular faith, as perhaps the gentleman approves of, then you say, oh, you go see a chaplain for your needs. However, if you're of no faith, you have to see a psychiatrist.

All of our men and women who bravely serve us deserve the same support.

I yield the remaining time to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend for yielding.

Nothing in this amendment in any way impairs the relationship between a Christian or Jewish or other soldier or servicemember and his or her faith leader. Nothing. Nothing in this amendment impairs the operation of the Chaplain Corps.

What this amendment does is to show respect for the choices made by our servicemembers. My Christianity is an important part of who I am and how I see my life. I don't think that that same right should be denied to a servicemember who does not share my beliefs.

What this amendment says is that, for the thousands of servicemembers who choose a humanist or atheistic philosophy system of life, that they

should be able to confide in an adviser who is not a mental health professional.

Going to a mental health professional is a choice that's laden with risk and some controversy for a member of the service. Going to a faith adviser is not.

Depriving those who share the views that Mr. POLIS outlined of the chance to go to such an adviser is unequal treatment. It's unworthy of the way we operate.

Nothing in this amendment disrupts the Chaplain Corps, but everything in this amendment respects the rights of our servicemembers. I would urge a ''yes'' vote.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, how much time do we have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California has 1¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. MCKEON. I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP), my good friend.

□ 1000

Mr. HUELSKAMP. I thank the chairman. I appreciate the opportunity to visit here today.

First, I'd like to visit about two heroes in the history of our country. One would be Father Emil Kapaun. I had the honor of being at the White House a couple of months ago where he was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor for his bravery in action of ministering to the needs of not only men and women of faith, but those who claim to have no faith.

In addition, I have the honor of being the nephew of a 95-year-old Army chaplain who also has been honored for serving, ministering to the needs of men and women in uniform.

One thing I will want to note is, instead of being dismissive of those types of sacrifices, I will read a little bit from the duties of the Chaplain Corps: ''Each chaplain shall hold appropriate religious services at least once on each Sunday.'' Or the Navy and Marines say: ''An officer in the Chaplain Corps may conduct public worship according to the manner and forms of the church of which he is a member'' and ''shall cause divine service to be performed on Sunday.'' It goes on and on. Obviously, that's our understanding of the chaplaincy.

Madam Chair, how is it that one can hold a religious service for an organization, as the amendment puts it, that does not consider itself to be a religion? It's completely contrary to the directions, instructions, and the very definition of the Chaplain Corps, represented by Father Emil Kapaun and numerous others, to extend appointments to groups in manners suggested by this amendment.

When you take away the worship, the prayer, everything that makes a religious service religious, you are left with counselors, as has been indicated. There are humanist, atheist, and ethical culturalist counselors available to folks that serve our country. In addition, I'm certain every chaplain that serves our brave men and women are available for those who do not share their faith, and that's the case.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment and be very supportive of our current brave men and women who serve alongside our members of the Armed Forces.

Mr. MCKEON. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. FOXX). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of June 13, 2013, it is now in order to consider amendment No. 23 printed in part B of House Report 113–108.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 79, after line 23, insert the following:

SEC. 241. LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR CERTAIN GROUND-BASED MIDCOURSE DEFENSE SYSTEM PURPOSES.

(a) LIMITATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2014 for the purposes described in paragraph (2) shall be obligated or expended until the Secretary of Defense—

(A) certifies to the congressional defense committees that—

(i) the ground-based midcourse defense system has performed at least two successful intercept tests at Vandenberg Air Force Base, California, before October 1, 2014; and

(ii) the Commander of the United States Northern Command has full confidence in the homeland missile defense system; and

(B) submits to such committees justification with respect to the national security requirement for expanding the ground-based missile defense site located at Fort Greely, Alaska, from 30 ground-based interceptors to 44 ground-based interceptors.

(2) PURPOSES DESCRIBED.—The purposes described in this paragraph are the following:

(A) Advance procurement of 14 ground-based interceptor rocket motor sets.

(B) The missile refurbishment project at Missile Field 1 at Fort Greely, Alaska.

(C) The mechanical-electrical building at such Missile Field.

(b) ANNUAL CERTIFICATIONS.—The Secretary shall annually submit to the congressional defense committees a certification of whether—

(1) the ground-based midcourse defense system has performed at least two successful intercept tests at Vandenberg Air Force Base, California; and

(2) the Commander of the United States Northern Command has full confidence in the homeland missile defense system.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Chair, this is a very simple amendment to reduce funding for the advanced procurement of 14 Ground-Based Interceptor missiles that simply don't work and are inefficient, and for the refurbishment of the costly Missile Field 1 at Fort Greely, Alaska, until the Department of Defense can certify to Congress that these programs have been adequately tested and work. It's simply a question of making sure that something works before we spend additional money on it.

The missile defense program was designed to intercept limited intermediate and long-range intercontinental ballistic missiles before they reenter the Earth's atmosphere. But Congress needs to ensure that these missiles are effective before we continue to provide the Department of Defense with a blank check.

Congress needs to verify every penny of taxpayer money we spend. We have a time of tradeoffs, and of course it's nice to be able to support every program, but during this time of deficits and sequestration we need to make sure we are vigilant to ensure that the money we spend on the Pentagon actually results in the maximum amount of heightened national security.

Since 1997, this weapons system has missed its target more than half the time. My amendment would limit the funding for the procurement of 14 Ground-Based Interceptors until the missiles have had two successful tests before 2015. Very reasonable. If it doesn't have two successful tests, why are we investing enormous amounts of taxpayer money in it?

So, two successful tests before 2015, certified by the Secretary of Defense to Congress as having the full confidence of the Commander of the United States Northern Command, and then it is allowed to move forward.

Now, opponents of this amendment—and I saw a Dear Colleague letter go out talking about how there are long-range missile threats from North Korea and Iran—there's no question, there is complete agreement about the dangers to this country, the dangers of a nuclear Iran, the dangers of a nuclear North Korea. What we're talking about here is the last thing we want to do is trust in an untested and unsuccessful missile to deter very real threats. We need a real threat deterrent system, not something that doesn't work. And my amendment simply requires that this is working.

My amendment would also limit funds for the missile refurbishment project in Missile Field 1 in Alaska. This field was never intended to be

operational. Former Defense Secretary Robert Gates and former Joint Chiefs Chairman Mike Mullen in 2011 said:

> Missile Field 1 was originally designed as a test bed, so it lacks required hardening and redundant power, and has significant infrastructure reliability issues.

There have also been reports of mold and leaks at the facility, and refurbishment would come at a tremendous cost to taxpayers without significantly improving the security that America has.

I urge Congress to demand that these programs work, that the programs we fund actually keep our families safe and are proven to work by certification by the Secretary of Defense.

We need to get our fiscal house in order, we need to make tough choices, and we need to make sure that our expenditures on national defense improve national security. And simply demanding that our costly missile defense system is actually capable of keeping our homeland safe is a very reasonable amendment to the National Defense Authorization bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCKEON. At this time, Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. I thank the chairman of the full committee.

I would urge defeat of this amendment. It would reverse what the Obama administration and Secretary of Defense Hagel came forward with on March 15 of this year. After seeing the North Korean threat only increase, they appropriately came to the decision to add more Ground-Based Interceptors.

Now, I believe the administration has been too slow to appropriately address the threats we have from in-coming missiles, but this is a good step forward, and so I applaud that.

The Secretary said:

> We will take steps in the United States to stay ahead of the challenge posed by Iran and North Korea's development of longer-range ballistic missile capabilities.

I have to agree with that. How we came to this point, I know that there has been some disagreement in the intelligence community, but the Defense Intelligence Agency said that they have moderate confidence that the North Koreans can put together long-range ballistic missiles and nuclear warheads. That is a threat we should take seriously. This amendment, if adopted, would not recognize that threat.

Also, by doing advanced procurement, we save the taxpayers $200 million. So this is ill-advised from a financial standpoint.

The military is adopting a fly-before-you-buy approach. There was one successful test a few months ago, another test is scheduled toward the end of this year. Those will be the two tests that the author of this amendment says that he wants.

So this amendment is totally unnecessary. It would delay what even the administration—which has been a little too slow—has said is appropriate. We should not slow things down further. The threats are real, they are serious, and we need to fund them appropriately.

I ask that you defeat this dangerous amendment.

Mr. MCKEON. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. I'd like to inquire of the Chair how much time remains.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Colorado has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. POLIS. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Again, I think that to have any type of meaningful missile defense against potential threats in Korea, Iran, and elsewhere, it needs to work. That's simply what this amendment says—two tests that work before $107 million in spending goes forth.

□ 1010

This is the financially responsible thing to do. Why would we want to spend first stage 107 million, over 6 years over a billion, on a system that doesn't work?

It's a very reasonable threshold to have a certification by the Department of Defense if this works. It provides an additional incentive to make sure that America stays safe, demonstrates this works, have an incentive to actually make it work before the rest of the money is released.

I think that's common sense. I think it aligns incentives of our contractors and our military and the defense of the American people. I think it's fiscally prudent. I think it improves our missile defense opportunities against threats from North Korea, Iran, and elsewhere; and I strongly encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to adopt this commonsense amendment that would save over 107 million for the ground-based interceptors in the first year, 135 million for the refurbishment of Missile Field 1, and also ensure that our missile defense system works by having two tests and a certification that it's operational by the Secretary of Defense.

I encourage my colleagues to support the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Texas, the vice chair of our committee, Mr. THORNBERRY.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Madam Chair, I'm convinced that the arguments against missile defense are the same today that they were the day that President Reagan proposed it: you can't do it, it costs too much, and it's provocative to try.

And it doesn't really matter how the threat evolves, what North Korea or Iran do, and it doesn't really matter how the technology evolves. We just had a successful test just a few months ago.

The events and facts don't matter. The arguments are still the same, and they will always be the same because some people just don't want to defend the country against missile attack.

This committee pushed in 2010, in 2011, and in 2012 to have more interceptors on the west coast. The President opposed it every step of the way. It didn't happen. And then, all of a sudden, with North Korea this year, the President changes his mind and says, Oh, maybe you all were right after all. At least the President changed his mind. Unfortunately, it seems like some people cannot even do that.

A lot of us think the administration is not doing enough, but to do less would be negligent, and I think we should reject this amendment.

Mr. MCKEON. Might I inquire how much time we have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chair, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Arizona, a member of our committee, Mr. FRANKS.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Madam Chair, ever since mankind took up arms against his fellow human beings, there has always been an offensive capability and a defensive capability to try to match it. The spear was met with the shield. The bullet was met with armor. And, today, we face the most dangerous weapons in the history of humanity in nuclear-armed missiles.

Madam Chair, we should have a capable defense. Our ground-based mid-course defense is the only system that we have that protects the American homeland from intercontinental ballistic missiles coming into this country. And, Madam Chair, it is a limited capability, and we should not further limit it in our policies here today.

As has been so eloquently stated earlier, the President of the United States cut our GBI capability in recent years and now has changed his mind to where we will go from 30 to 44 interceptors. And with a 3- or 4-to-1 shot doctrine, that may give us the ability to defend ourselves up against as many as a dozen incoming missiles.

Madam Chair, it's all right if we have a few too many, but if we have one too few, it changes everything. Across the world, we've all understood that the more we sweat in peace, the less we bleed in war. We need desperately to make sure that we do our fundamental job in this Congress and in this Federal Government by making sure that we protect the citizens against the most dangerous weapons mankind has ever devised, and, Madam Chair, this is why we want to reject this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 39 OFFERED BY MR. VAN HOLLEN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 39 printed in part B of House Report 113–108.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Chairman, I rise to offer the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 563, after line 11, insert the following:

SEC. 1510. FUNDING LEVELS AS REQUESTED IN PRESIDENT'S BUDGET.

(a) REDUCTIONS.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amounts authorized to be appropriated in this subtitle, as specified in the corresponding funding tables in sections 4102, 4202, 4302, 4402, and 4502, for additional funds for overseas contingency operations are hereby reduced by a total of $5,043,828,000.

(b) DEFICIT REDUCTION.—The amount reduced under subsection (a) shall not be available for any purpose other than deficit reduction.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

I'm very pleased to offer this bipartisan amendment along with my colleagues, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. WOODALL. I'm very pleased that it has the support of the ranking member of the Armed Services Committee, Mr. SMITH.

This amendment is about truth in budgeting and making sure our military has the resources it needs to prosecute the war in Afghanistan and overseas contingency operations. The Defense Department budget is split into two parts: the base budget for ongoing operations and the part of the budget for the war and overseas contingency operations.

What this budget does is provide the military with exactly the resources they say they need in fiscal year 2014 for the overseas contingency account. In fact, on Wednesday, Secretary of Defense Hagel and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Dempsey, General Dempsey, said that what they needed was what would be provided as a result of this amendment. The problem is the underlying bill added another $5 billion, and this is becoming a slush fund, Madam Chairman.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chair, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCKEON. I yield 1 minute at this time to my friend and colleague, the chair of the Readiness Subcommittee, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN).

Mr. WITTMAN. Madam Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, our most important job here, our most sacred duty as outlined in article 1, section 8 of the Constitution is to ''raise and support Armies''—to support the men and women we ask to fight on behalf of our Nation on the fields of battle. This money supports our constitutional duty and, most importantly, our warfighters.

This amendment seriously jeopardizes national security and our ability to replenish readiness accounts raided in prior years to fund underfunded war costs.

The majority of our forces still fighting Afghanistan will be there at least until December 2014. Remember, the goal is December 2014. The war is not over, and these funds are needed to help them do their jobs and execute their missions as outlined in the strategic plan.

Stripping this money from the overseas contingency fund, literally from our all-volunteer force that is engaged in combat operations, places the plan in jeopardy and makes the December 2014 goal irrelevant.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Chairman, I find it interesting that the gentleman would suggest that the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary of Defense are not asking for the resources needed to protect our men and women in battle.

I now yield 1½ minutes to Mr. MULVANEY.

Mr. MULVANEY. Madam Chairwoman, I haven't been here very long, only 3 years, but I've seen a pattern developing now which is that each year the Defense Department, the Pentagon, comes over and asks for a certain amount of money, and then we give them more than they ask for.

What the amendment does today is simply gives the Pentagon what they ask for. They asked for $80 billion to run the overseas contingency operation. For some reason, we decided to give them 85 billion. They come in; they defined a mission and they tell us what it costs to do that; and then, for some reason, we decide to give them more. All we're doing today is taking the folks who run the military at their word that they know what it costs to defend this Nation.

I think it bears repeating that both Secretary Hagel and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs were here just last week and said that $80 billion worth of OCO funding was enough to meet the mission. Simply spending more money than the Defense Department asks for does not mean we are stronger on defense than anybody else. It's simply foolish to waste money. If the Pentagon tells us they need $80 billion, we should look seriously at giving them $80 billion.

□ 1020

I disagree respectfully with my friend from Virginia who says that this amendment will hurt national security. If you assume that, then you must assume that what the Pentagon asked for in the first place would hurt national security.

I'm simply not willing to agree to that. I'm not willing to believe that the Pentagon would come over and ask for an amount of money that would be bad for national defense.

This is a commonsense amendment, it gives the Defense Department exactly what they need, and it gets us out of this rut of equating higher spending with a stronger nation defense.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chair, I might note that the same gentleman last year said they haven't had enough money, and they spent $13 billion more.

At this time, I yield 1 minute to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Nevada, Dr. HECK.

Mr. HECK of Nevada. Madam Chair, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment.

This amendment will severely undermine the operational readiness of our Guard and Reserve forces. Over the past decade, we have built incredible capability in our Guard and Reserve, and that capability was largely paid for by overseas contingency operation funds.

To mitigate the risk associated with this administration's force reductions of 100,000 Active component servicemembers, our Nation will have to rely on our Reserve component. In fact, in testimony before the House Armed Services Committee, Army Chief of Staff General Odierno stated that ''in order to lessen the risk of Active Duty force reductions, the Army will continue to rely on Reserve components to provide key enablers and operational depth.''

Decreased funding has already resulted in the cancelation of numerous of Guard and Reserve deployments, which substantially undermines the capabilities and readiness of these units.

It is for these reasons that I strongly urge my colleagues to reject this amendment.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Chairman, I would just urge all Members to read the amendment itself. There is nothing in here that says we will reduce one penny from the National Guard and Reserve. This is an across-the-board provision and it will be disproportionate.

At this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

We are about to authorize more than half a trillion dollars for our military. The Secretary of Defense and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff says ''we don't want or need this extra $5

billion.'' What's our response? We tell him, No, you have to spend that, but you also have to cut $50 billion from our military in the most stupid, irresponsible, irrational manner possible. And within that $50 billion you have to get $2 billion of savings by furloughing 650,000 Department of Defense employees.

So we are going to save $2 billion by furloughing 650,000 people, but we are going to force them to spend $5 billion over in Afghanistan while we furlough people here.

What's the rationale? We can't justify that. Of course we should hold to what our military says they need in Afghanistan. We ought to also give them what they feel they need here in the United States.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chair, let me note that the National Guard Association, the Reserve Officers Association, and the National Governors Association all oppose this amendment.

At this time, I would like to yield 1 minute to my friend and colleague, chair of the Seapower Subcommittee, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. FORBES).

Mr. FORBES. Madam Chairman, over the last 4 years, the administration has told the Pentagon—the Pentagon has come back—and they have cut out of national defense $778 billion before they even get to sequestration. Each time they acknowledge they increase the risk, and their definition of ''risk'' is ''acceptable risk.'' When you ask them what that means, it means how many ships we can lose, how many planes we can lose, how many men and women we can lose and still have some probability that we will win the conflict if every single assumption that they make holds true.

If you support that definition of acceptable risk, you need to vote for this amendment. But I believe we need to change the definition of acceptable risk and say it means this: when we send one of our men and women into conflict we have done everything reasonably possible to make sure they have the highest probability possible of returning to the home they are defending and to the families that they love.

If you support that definition of acceptable risk, you need to defeat this amendment.

The ACTING CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland has 1 minute and 15 seconds remaining.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

At this time, I yield 1 minute to my friend, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL).

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Chair, I rise in strong support of this amendment.

I would say to my friends on the Republican side of the aisle who have spoken, I agree with absolutely everything you have said. But as I look at the chairman, who I know has more of a love for this Nation and our national security than perhaps any other Member of this body, he and I both voted in favor of the Budget Control Act in August of 2011. Rightly or wrongly, we set the law of the land of how much we were going to spend on national defense. Today, we are talking about how much we are going to spend in Afghanistan.

If we need to spend more money to improve National Guard readiness here at home, to deal with maintenance accounts here at home, we need to come together and change those budget caps; and I support doing that. But I am tired of living in a town where when you don't like the rules, you find a way around them. When the President doesn't like the law of the land, he just ignores it. If we don't like the defense budget caps, we just ignore it and fund it through OCO instead.

We ought to give the Joint Chiefs of Staff every penny they're asking for to support our men and women in Afghanistan. If they come back and ask for more, we should give them every penny of that as well.

But the law means something; these caps mean something. We should either change it or stick with it, Madam Chair.

Mr. MCKEON. Note that OCO was not included in the Budget Control Act, and we are totally within the Budget Control Act on this budget.

Madam Chairman, at this time, I yield 30 seconds to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Chair, as counterintuitive as it may appear, when there is a drawdown, there may be a long-term savings, but short-term savings are not there. In fact, the cost spikes.

As all the equipment comes back from the warrior that has to go to the depots for resetting, repair, and restoration, that is an extreme cost that has to be borne by the depots if it is not in this particular bill.

That is one of the reasons why I support the chair's mark, which is supported by the chairman, as well as Chairman RYAN, and as well as the original Obama budget when it was sent here before. For whatever reason, they decided to pull $5 billion out without giving us a plan going forward. This needs to stay.

The ACTING CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland has 15 seconds remaining.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chairman, might I inquire as to the time we have left.

The ACTING CHAIR. The gentleman from California has 1½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Maryland has 15 seconds remaining.

Mr. MCKEON. And who will be closing?

The ACTING CHAIR. The gentleman from California has the right to close.

Mr. MCKEON. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

I yield 1 minute to my friend and colleague, a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN).

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The rationale we have been talking about here is a human rationale. We have, as we speak, over 60,000 military serving doing the work of freedom in Afghanistan.

As they prepare to leave, we should not be cutting funding in these very dangerous times. As you are leaving, you are incredibly vulnerable. They're still in the fight, they're still working hard, they need to protect themselves.

While the administration hasn't offered any strategic plan, other than a date for withdrawal, those who serve there deserve our support because they have an important mission to perform. Whether it is in Kabul or a forward-operating base, they are in a dangerous situation.

The reality is that things in Afghanistan are hotter than the administration estimated in their budget request. We need this money for contingencies. We need this money because of the delay due to Pakistan affecting our ground transportation—our exit.

I strongly oppose this amendment and urge my colleagues to do it as well.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to my friend and colleague, the gentlelady from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

□ 1030

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

Today, I stand to support keeping the money—that $5 billion—that we need for readiness, and here is why: I think it is absolutely immoral that we would sign up, suit up and ship out men and women in uniform and not give them the readiness and the skills and the training that they need. The flying hours program is a great example of that. In the $5 billion that the gentleman would like to cut is the money for the flying hours program—37,000 flying hours. It would equip us with 500 aviators, whom we need. Let's fund these efforts for the men and women in uniform.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Chairman, I find it interesting that the gentlelady would suggest that the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Dempsey, would ask for an amount of money for our warfighters that is immoral. What is cynical is to use the Afghan and overseas contingency account as a slush fund to fund operations that are part of the base budget.

This is about truth in budgeting. I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 53 OFFERED BY MR. WALZ

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 53 printed in part B of House Report 113–108.

Mr. WALZ. I have an amendment at the desk, Madam Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title V, add the following new section:

SEC. 5___. COMPTROLLER GENERAL REPORT ON USE OF DETERMINATION OF PERSONALITY DISORDER OR ADJUSTMENT DISORDER AS BASIS TO SEPARATE MEMBERS FROM THE ARMED FORCES.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report evaluating—

(1) the use by the Secretaries of the military departments, since January 1, 2007, of the authority to separate members of the Armed Forces from the Armed Forces due of unfitness for duty because of a mental condition not amounting to disability, including separation on the basis of a personality disorder or adjustment disorder and the total number of members separated on such basis;

(2) the extent to which the Secretaries failed to comply with regulatory requirements in separating members of the Armed Forces on the basis of a personality or adjustment disorder; and

(3) the impact of such a separation on the ability of veterans so separated to access service-connected disability compensation, disability severance pay, and disability retirement pay.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. WALZ) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WALZ. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Sergeant Chuck Luther joined the Army after the 9/11 attacks. He served in Iraq until a mortar round hit near him, knocking him unconscious. What followed were classic symptoms of traumatic brain injury—blurred vision, chronic pain, and trouble concentrating.

Liz Luras served this Nation honorably as a soldier in the United States Army. She survived a rape at the hands of her fellow servicemember. She did her best to continue her military service with the dream of attending West Point. She was raped two more times, with police reports and hospital visits to prove it.

I know each of my colleagues here would expect that both of these warriors would receive the best care this Nation could provide. Sadly, the reality is far from that.

Along with Liz and Chuck, since 2001, over 31,000 of our warriors have been discharged from the military, without benefits, because they were determined to have had a personality or an adjustment disorder. These are considered preexisting conditions, which means they should never have been allowed to enlist in the first place. Even though Sergeant Luther had multiple mental health evaluations and served honorably for a decade, it was only after the mortar attack that the military determined he had a preexisting condition, casually threw him away and denied him benefits and health care.

A 2008 GAO study concluded that at least 40 percent of these personality discharges were handed down without going through the proper Department of Defense process, which means without the servicemember's being diagnosed by a licensed mental health professional, without the servicemember's receiving notification of his discharge and without the servicemember's receiving any formal counseling. Five years after this report, Congress has done nothing to ensure that these servicemembers' records are reviewed or corrected, or to ensure that they receive the care that they earned serving this Nation.

This week, the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM) and I presented an amendment to this bill that would have allowed these warriors the basic appeal process to determine if they were improperly discharged. This amendment is the same as a bill I have, H.R. 975. This would only afford these warriors basic rights and due processes—the same ones that they put their lives on the line for that we have. That amendment was not allowed to come to this floor for debate or for a vote. Shame on us.

A second amendment I offered would have simply put a moratorium on this process until we understood why it was being done and what was happening. That amendment was not allowed to come to this floor to be debated or voted on. Shame on us.

Now, I want to be clear: the chairman and the ranking member of this committee had nothing to do with those decisions, and I am appreciative that they allowed the amendment that I'm debating today to be brought here. That's going to allow us to do another GAO study to determine if the problem is still there.

Fine and good, but I'll tell you what: Chuck Luther doesn't want a study—he wants justice. Liz Luras doesn't want a study—she wants justice. The American people don't want another study—they want justice for their warriors.

I would ask each of my colleagues to go home this weekend and ask your constituents if they think this is fair and if they want a study, or if they'd rather do what's right and take care of these warriors.

I'd also challenge my colleagues to ask the questions: Why wasn't the amendment made in order? Why couldn't we debate other than have a study?

So I ask my colleagues to support this amendment. It's something. It will let us know what the scope of this self-inflicted injury and tragedy to our Nation is. It's not enough. It's not nearly enough. We should be ashamed that we've not shown Liz and Chuck the same respect and courage that they showed us as a Nation to serve in uniform. I, for one, am not going to rest until justice is served, our warriors are cared for and this wrong is made right.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chair, I rise to claim the time in opposition, but I will not oppose the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCKEON. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Minnesota has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. WALZ. I rise once again to thank the chairman. I thank him for understanding this.

As I say again very clearly, this was not the chairman's decision. He was gracious enough to bring this down, and I appreciate his support—the same to the ranking member.

I would just say to my colleagues: don't let this issue drop. Get this right. We owe it to our warriors.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. WALZ).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. MCKEON

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chair, pursuant to H. Res. 260, I offer amendments en bloc.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc No. 8 consisting of amendment Nos. 73, 146, 149, 150, 152, 153, 156, 157, 158, 161, 163, 166, 170, 171, and 172, printed in House Report No. 113–108, offered by Mr. MCKEON of California:

AMENDMENT NO. 73 OFFERED BY MR. SWALWELL OF CALIFORNIA

Page 273, after line 10, insert the following:

SEC. 595. GIFTS MADE FOR THE BENEFIT OF MILITARY MUSICAL UNITS.

Section 974 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (d) and (e) as subsections (e) and (f), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

''(d) PERFORMANCES FUNDED BY PRIVATE DONATION.—Notwithstanding section 2601(c) of this title, any gift made to the Secretary of Defense under section 2601 on the condition that such gift be used for the benefit of

a military musical unit shall be credited to the appropriation or account providing the funds for such military musical unit. Any amount so credited shall be merged with amounts in the appropriation or account to which credited, and shall be available for the same purposes, and subject to the same conditions and limitations, as amounts in such appropriation or account.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 146 OFFERED BY MR. CONYERS OF MICHIGAN

Page 551, line 12, add at the end before the period the following: ''or Iran''.

AMENDMENT NO. 149 OFFERED BY MR. HANNA OF NEW YORK

Page 582, insert after line 25 the following:

SEC. 1607. CREDIT FOR CERTAIN SUBCONTRACTORS .

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 8(d) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(d)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(16) CREDIT FOR CERTAIN SUBCONTRACTOR.—For purposes of determining whether or not a prime contractor has attained the percentage goals specified in paragraph (6)—

''(A) if the subcontracting goals pertain only to a single contract with the executive agency, the prime contractor shall receive credit for small business concerns performing as first tier subcontractors or subcontractors at any tier pursuant to the subcontracting plans required under paragraph (6)(D) in an amount equal to the dollar value of work awarded to such small business concerns; and

''(B) if the subcontracting goals pertain to more than one contract with one or more executive agencies, or to one contract with more than one executive agency, the prime contractor may only count first tier subcontractors that are small business concerns.''.

(b) DEFINITIONS PERTAINING TO SUBCONTRACTING.—Section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(dd) DEFINITIONS PERTAINING TO SUBCONTRACTING.—In this Act:

''(1) SUBCONTRACT.—The term 'subcontract' means a legally binding agreement between a contractor that is already under contract to another party to perform work, and a third party, hereinafter referred to as the subcontractor, for the subcontractor to perform a part, or all, of the work that the contractor has undertaken.

''(2) FIRST TIER SUBCONTRACTOR.—The term 'first tier subcontractor' means a subcontractor who has a subcontract directly with the prime contractor.

''(3) AT ANY TIER.—The term 'at any tier' means any subcontractor other than a subcontractor who is a first tier subcontractor.''.

SEC. 1608. GAO STUDY ON SUBCONTRACTING REPORTING SYSTEMS.

Not later than 365 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate a report studying the feasibility of using Federal subcontracting reporting systems, including the Federal subaward reporting system required by section 2 of the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 and any electronic subcontracting reporting award system used by the Small Business Administration, to attribute subcontractors to particular contracts in the case of contractors that have subcontracting plans under section 8(d) of the Small Business Act that pertain to multiple contracts with executive agencies.

AMENDMENT NO. 150 OFFERED BY MR. GRAVES OF MISSOURI

Page 582, insert after line 25 the following:

SEC. 1607. INAPPLICABILITY OF REQUIREMENT TO REVIEW AND JUSTIFY CERTAIN CONTRACTS.

In the case of a contract to which the provisions of section 46 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 657s) apply, the requirements under section 802 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 do not apply.

AMENDMENT NO. 152 OFFERED BY MR. COLLINS OF GEORGIA

At the end of title XXI, add the following new section:

SECTION _____. TRANSFER OF ADMINISTRATIVE JURISDICTION, CAMP FRANK D. MERRILL, DAHLONEGA, GEORGIA.

(a) TRANSFER REQUIRED.—Not later than September 30, 2014, the Secretary of Agriculture shall transfer to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army for required Army force protection measures certain Federal land administered as part of the Chattahoochee National Forest, but permitted to the Secretary of the Army for Camp Frank D. Merrill in Dahlonega, Georgia, consisting of approximately 282.304 acres identified in the permit numbered 0018-01.

(b) USE OF TRANSFERRED LAND.—Upon receipt of the land under subsection (a), the Secretary of the Army shall continue to use the land for military purposes.

(c) PROTECTION OF THE ETOWAH DARTER AND HOLIDAY DARTER.—Nothing in the transfer required by subsection (a) shall affect the prior designation of lands within the Chattahoochee National Forest as critical habitat for the Etowah darter (Etheostoma etowahae) and the Holiday darter (Etheostoma brevirostrum).

(d) LEGAL DESCRIPTION AND MAP.—

(1) PREPARATION AND PUBLICATION.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall publish in the Federal Register a legal description and map of the land to be transferred under subsection (a) not later than 180 days of this Act's enactment.

(2) FORCE OF LAW.—The legal description and map filed under paragraph (1) shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act, except that the Secretary of Agriculture may correct errors in the legal description and map.

(e) REIMBURSEMENTS OF COSTS.—The transfer required by subsection (a) shall be made without reimbursement, except that the Secretary of the Army shall reimburse the Secretary of Agriculture for any costs incurred by the Secretary of Agriculture to prepare the legal description and map under subsection (c).

AMENDMENT NO. 153 OFFERED BY MR. MURPHY OF PENNSYLVANIA

At the end of title XXVII, add the following new section:

SEC. 27____. CONSIDERATION OF THE VALUE OF SERVICES PROVIDED BY A LOCAL COMMUNITY TO THE ARMED FORCES AS PART OF THE ECONOMIC ANALYSIS IN MAKING BASE REALIGNMENT OR CLOSURE DECISIONS.

As part of the economic analysis conducted in making any base realignment or closure decision under section 2687 of title 10, United States Code, or other base realignment or closure authority, or in making any decision under section 993 of such title to reduce the number of members of the armed forces assigned at a military installation, the Secretary of Defense shall include an accounting of the value of services, such as schools, libraries, and utilities, as well as land, structures, and access to infrastructure, such as airports and seaports, that are provided by the local community to the military installation and that result in cost savings for the Armed Forces.

AMENDMENT NO. 156 OFFERED BY MR. BLUMENAUER OF OREGON

Page 617, after line 22, insert the following:

SEC. 2809. DEVELOPMENT OF MASTER PLANS FOR MAJOR MILITARY INSTALLATIONS.

Section 2864 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking ''At a time'' and inserting ''(1) At a time''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(2) To address the requirements under paragraph (1), each installation master plan shall include consideration of—

''(A) planning for compact and infill development;

''(B) horizontal and vertical mixed-use development;

''(C) the full lifecycle costs of planning decisions;

''(D) healthy communities with a focus on walking, running and biking infrastructure, pedestrian and cycling plans, and community green and garden space; and

''(E) capacity planning through the establishment of growth boundaries around cantonment areas to focus development towards the core and preserve range and training space.''.

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking ''The transportation'' and inserting ''(1) The transportation''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(2) To address the requirements under subsection (a) and paragraph (1), each installation master plan shall include consideration of ways to diversify and connect transit systems that do not neglect the pedestrian realm and enable safe walking or biking.'';

(3) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (e); and

(4) by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsections:

''(c) VERTICAL MIXED USES.—A master plan for a major military installation shall be designed to strongly multi-story, mixed-use facility solutions that are sited in walkable complexes so as to avoid, when reasonable, single-purpose, inflexible facilities that are sited in a sprawling manner. Vertical mixed-use infrastructure can integrate government, non-government, or jointly financed construction within a single unit.

''(d) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this section shall supercede the requirements of section 2859(a) of this title.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 157 OFFERED BY MR. GARDNER OF COLORADO

At the end of subtitle B of title XXVIII, add the following new section:

SEC. 28____. CONDITIONS ON DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EXPANSION OF PIÑON CANYON MANEUVER SITE, FORT CARSON, COLORADO.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Following Japan's attack on Pearl Harbor, Fort Carson was established in 1942 and has since been a vital contributor to our Nation's defense and a valued part of the State of Colorado.

(2) The units at Fort Carson have served with a great honor and distinction in the current War on Terror.

(3) The current Piñon Canyon Maneuver Site near Fort Carson, Colorado, plays an important role in training our men and women in uniform so they are as prepared and effective as possible before going off to war.

(b) CONDITIONS ON EXPANSION.—The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Army may not acquire any land to expand the size of the Piñon Canyon Maneuver Site near Fort Carson, Colorado, unless each of the following occurs:

(1) The land acquisition is specifically authorized in an Act of Congress enacted after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) Funds are specifically appropriated for the land acquisition.

(3) The Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of the Army, as the case may be, completes an environmental impact statement with respect to the land acquisition.

AMENDMENT NO. 158 OFFERED BY MR. HUNTER OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of subtitle F of title XXVIII, add the following:

SEC. 2866. INCLUSION OF EMBLEMS OF BELIEF AS PART OF MILITARY MEMORIALS.

(a) INCLUSION OF EMBLEMS OF BELIEF AUTHORIZED.—Chapter 21 of title 36, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"§ 2115. Inclusion of emblems of belief as part of military memorials

''(a) AUTHORIZED INCLUSION.—For the purpose of honoring the sacrifice of members of the United States Armed Forces, including those members who make the ultimate sacrifice in defense of the United States, emblems of belief may be included as part of—

''(1) a military memorial that is established or acquired by the United States Government; or

''(2) a military memorial that is not established by the United States Government, but for which the American Battle Monuments Commission cooperated in the establishment of the memorial.

''(b) SCOPE OF INCLUSION.—When including emblems of belief as part of a military memorial, any approved emblem of belief may be included on such a memorial. The list of approved emblems of belief shall include, at a minimum, all those emblems of belief authorized by the National Cemetery Administration.

''(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) The terms 'emblem of belief' and 'emblems of belief' refer to the emblems of belief contained on the list maintained by the National Cemetery Administration for placement on Government-provided headstones and markers.

''(2) The term 'military memorial' means a memorial or monument commemorating the service of the United States Armed Forces. The term includes works of architecture and art described in section 2105(b) of this title.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following:

''2115. Inclusion of emblems of belief as part of military memorials.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 161 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF WASHINGTON

At the end of subtitle D of title XXXI, insert the following:

SEC. 3145. CONVEYANCE OF LAND AT THE HANFORD SITE.

(a) CONVEYANCE REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Energy shall convey, for consideration at the estimated fair market value or, in accordance with paragraph (2), below such value, to the Community Reuse Organization of the Hanford Site (in this section referred to as the ''Organization'') all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the real property, including any improvements thereon, described in paragraph (3).

(2) CONSIDERATION.—The Secretary may convey real property pursuant to paragraph (1) for consideration below the estimated fair market value of the real property, or without consideration, only if the Organization—

(A) agrees that the net proceeds from any sale or lease of the real property (or any portion thereof) received by the Organization during at least the seven-year period beginning on the date of such conveyance will be used to support the economic redevelopment of, or related to, the Hanford Site; and

(B) executes the agreement for such conveyance and accepts control of the real property within a reasonable time.

(3) REAL PROPERTY DESCRIBED.—The real property described in this paragraph is the real property consisting of two parcels of land of approximately 1,341 acres and 300 acres, respectively, of the Hanford Reservation, as requested by the Community Reuse Organization for the Hanford Site on May 31, 2011, and October 13, 2011, and as depicted within the proposed boundaries on the map titled ''Attachment 2—Revised Map'' included in the letter sent by the Community Reuse Organization for the Hanford Site to the Department of Energy on October 13, 2011.

(b) PRIORITY CONSIDERATION.—The Secretary shall actively solicit, and provide priority consideration to, the views of the cities and counties adjacent to the Hanford Site with respect to the development and execution of the Hanford Comprehensive Land Use Plan.

AMENDMENT NO. 163 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF WASHINGTON

At the end of title XXXI, add the following new section:

SEC. 31___. MANHATTAN PROJECT NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK.

(a) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this section are—

(1) to preserve and protect for the benefit of present and future generations the nationally significant historic resources associated with the Manhattan Project and which are under the jurisdiction of the Department of Energy defense environmental cleanup program under this title;

(2) to improve public understanding of the Manhattan Project and the legacy of the Manhattan Project through interpretation of the historic resources associated with the Manhattan Project;

(3) to enhance public access to the Historical Park consistent with protection of public safety, national security, and other aspects of the mission of the Department of Energy; and

(4) to assist the Department of Energy, Historical Park communities, historical societies, and other interested organizations and individuals in efforts to preserve and protect the historically significant resources associated with the Manhattan Project.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) HISTORICAL PARK.—The term ''Historical Park'' means the Manhattan Project National Historical Park established under subsection (c).

(2) MANHATTAN PROJECT.—The term ''Manhattan Project'' means the Federal military program to develop an atomic bomb ending on December 31, 1946.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

(c) ESTABLISHMENT OF MANHATTAN PROJECT NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—

(A) DATE.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, there shall be established as a unit of the National Park System the Manhattan Project National Historical Park.

(B) AREAS INCLUDED.—The Historical Park shall consist of facilities and areas listed under paragraph (2) as determined by the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy. The Secretary shall include the area referred to in paragraph (2)(C)(i), the B Reactor National Historic Landmark, in the Historical Park.

(2) ELIGIBLE AREAS.—The Historical Park may only be comprised of one or more of the following areas, or portions of the areas, as generally depicted in the map titled ''Manhattan Project National Historical Park Sites'', numbered 540/108,834–C, and dated September 2012:

(A) OAK RIDGE, TENNESSEE.—Facilities, land, or interests in land that are—

(i) at Buildings 9204–3 and 9731 at the Department of Energy Y–12 National Security Complex;

(ii) at the X–10 Graphite Reactor at the Department of Energy Oak Ridge National Laboratory;

(iii) at the K–25 Building site at the Department of Energy East Tennessee Technology Park; and

(iv) at the former Guest House located at 210 East Madison Road.

(B) LOS ALAMOS, NEW MEXICO.—Facilities, land, or interests in land that are—

(i) in the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory National Historic Landmark District, or any addition to the Landmark District proposed in the National Historic Landmark Nomination—Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory (LASL) NHL District (Working Draft of NHL Revision), Los Alamos National Laboratory document LA–UR 12–00387 (January 26, 2012);

(ii) at the former East Cafeteria located at 1670 Nectar Street; and

(iii) at the former dormitory located at 1725 17th Street.

(C) HANFORD, WASHINGTON.—Facilities, land, or interests in land on the Department of Energy Hanford Nuclear Reservation that are—

(i) the B Reactor National Historic Landmark;

(ii) the Hanford High School in the town of Hanford and Hanford Construction Camp Historic District;

(iii) the White Bluffs Bank building in the White Bluffs Historic District;

(iv) the warehouse at the Bruggemann's Agricultural Complex;

(v) the Hanford Irrigation District Pump House; and

(vi) the T Plant (221–T Process Building).

(3) WRITTEN CONSENT OF OWNER.—No non-Federal property may be included in the Historical Park without the written consent of the owner.

(d) AGREEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary and the Secretary of Energy (acting through the Oak Ridge, Los Alamos, and Richland site offices) shall enter into an agreement governing the respective roles of the Secretary and the Secretary of Energy in administering the facilities, land, or interests in land under the administrative jurisdiction of the Department of Energy that is to be included in the Historical Park under subsection (c)(2), including provisions for enhanced public access, management, interpretation, and historic preservation.

(2) RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE SECRETARY.—Any agreement under paragraph (1) shall provide that the Secretary shall—

(A) have decisionmaking authority for the content of historic interpretation of the Manhattan Project for purposes of administering the Historical Park; and

(B) ensure that the agreement provides an appropriate advisory role for the National Park Service in preserving the historic resources covered by the agreement.

(3) RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE SECRETARY OF ENERGY.—Any agreement under paragraph (1) shall provide that the Secretary of Energy—

(A) shall ensure that the agreement appropriately protects public safety, national security, and other aspects of the ongoing mission of the Department of Energy at the Oak Ridge Reservation, Los Alamos National Laboratory, and Hanford Site;

(B) may consult with and provide historical information to the Secretary concerning the Manhattan Project;

(C) shall retain responsibility, in accordance with applicable law, for any environmental remediation that may be necessary in or around the facilities, land, or interests in land governed by the agreement; and

(D) shall retain authority and legal obligations for historic preservation and general maintenance, including to ensure safe access, in connection with the Department's Manhattan Project resources.

(4) AMENDMENTS.—The agreement under paragraph (1) may be amended, including to add to the Historical Park facilities, land, or interests in land within the eligible areas described in subsection (c)(2) that are under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Energy.

(e) PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall consult with interested State, county, and local officials, organizations, and interested members of the public—

(A) before executing any agreement under subsection (d); and

(B) in the development of the general management plan under subsection (f)(2).

(2) NOTICE OF DETERMINATION.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which an agreement under subsection (d) is entered into, the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register notice of the establishment of the Historical Park, including an official boundary map.

(3) AVAILABILITY OF MAP.—The official boundary map published under paragraph (2) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the National Park Service. The map shall be updated to reflect any additions to the Historical Park from eligible areas described in subsection (c)(2).

(4) ADDITIONS.—Any land, interest in land, or facility within the eligible areas described in subsection (c)(2) that is acquired by the Secretary or included in an amendment to the agreement under subsection (d)(4) shall be added to the Historical Park.

(f) ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall administer the Historical Park in accordance with—

(A) this section; and

(B) the laws generally applicable to units of the National Park System, including—

(i) the National Park System Organic Act (16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.); and

(ii) the Act of August 21, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 461 et seq.).

(2) GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN.—Not later than 3 years after the date on which funds are made available to carry out this subsection, the Secretary, with the concurrence of the Secretary of Energy, and in consultation and collaboration with the Oak Ridge, Los Alamos and Richland Department of Energy site offices, shall complete a general management plan for the Historical Park in accordance with section 12(b) of Public Law 91–383 (commonly known as the National Park Service General Authorities Act; 16 U.S.C. 1a–7(b)).

(3) INTERPRETIVE TOURS.—The Secretary may, subject to applicable law, provide interpretive tours of historically significant Manhattan Project sites and resources in the States of Tennessee, New Mexico, and Washington that are located outside the boundary of the Historical Park.

(4) LAND ACQUISITION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may acquire land and interests in land within the eligible areas described in subsection (c)(2) by—

(i) transfer of administrative jurisdiction from the Department of Energy by agreement between the Secretary and the Secretary of Energy;

(ii) donation; or

(iii) exchange.

(B) NO USE OF CONDEMNATION.—The Secretary may not acquire by condemnation any land or interest in land under this section or for the purposes of this section.

(5) DONATIONS; COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—

(A) FEDERAL FACILITIES.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may enter into one or more agreements with the head of a Federal agency to provide public access to, and management, interpretation, and historic preservation of, historically significant Manhattan Project resources under the jurisdiction or control of the Federal agency.

(ii) DONATIONS; COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—The Secretary may accept donations from, and enter into cooperative agreements with, State governments, units of local government, tribal governments, organizations, or individuals to further the purpose of an interagency agreement entered into under clause (i) or to provide visitor services and administrative facilities within reasonable proximity to the Historical Park.

(B) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary may provide technical assistance to State, local, or tribal governments, organizations, or individuals for the management, interpretation, and historic preservation of historically significant Manhattan Project resources not included within the Historical Park.

(C) DONATIONS TO DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY.—For the purposes of this section, or for the purpose of preserving and providing access to historically significant Manhattan Project resources, the Secretary of Energy may accept, hold, administer, and use gifts, bequests, and devises (including labor and services).

(g) CLARIFICATION.—

(1) NO BUFFER ZONE CREATED.—Nothing in this section, the establishment of the Historical Park, or the management plan for the Historical Park shall be construed to create buffer zones outside of the Historical Park. That an activity can be seen and heard from within the Historical Park shall not preclude the conduct of that activity or use outside the Historical Park.

(2) NO CAUSE OF ACTION.—Nothing in this section shall constitute a cause of action with respect to activities outside or adjacent to the established boundary of the Historical Park.

AMENDMENT NO. 166 OFFERED BY MR. ISSA OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of the bill, add the following new division:

DIVISION E—FEDERAL INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ACQUISITION REFORM ACT

SEC. 5001. SHORT TITLE.

This division may be cited as the ''Federal Information Technology Acquisition Reform Act''.

SEC. 5002. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents for this division is as follows:

SEC. 5003. DEFINITIONS.

In this division:

(1) CHIEF ACQUISITION OFFICERS COUNCIL.—The term ''Chief Acquisition Officers Council'' means the Chief Acquisition Officers Council established by section 1311(a) of title 41, United States Code.

(2) CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER.—The term ''Chief Information Officer'' means a Chief Information Officer (as designated under section 3506(a)(2) of title 44, United States Code)

of an agency listed in section 901(b) of title 31, United States Code.

(3) CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICERS COUNCIL.—The term ''Chief Information Officers Council'' or ''CIO Council'' means the Chief Information Officers Council established by section 3603(a) of title 44, United States Code.

(4) DIRECTOR.—The term ''Director'' means the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

(5) FEDERAL AGENCY.—The term ''Federal agency'' means each agency listed in section 901(b) of title 31, United States Code.

(6) FEDERAL CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER.—The term ''Federal Chief Information Officer'' means the Administrator of the Office of Electronic Government established under section 3602 of title 44, United States Code.

(7) INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY OR IT.—The term ''information technology'' or ''IT'' has the meaning provided in section 11101(6) of title 40, United States Code.

(8) RELEVANT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ''relevant congressional committees'' means each of the following:

(A) The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives.

(B) The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate.

TITLE LI—MANAGEMENT OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY WITHIN FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

SEC. 5101. INCREASED AUTHORITY OF AGENCY CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICERS OVER INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY.

(a) PRESIDENTIAL APPOINTMENT OF CIOS OF CERTAIN AGENCIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 11315 of title 40, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by redesignating subsection (a) as subsection (e) and moving such subsection to the end of the section; and

(B) by inserting before subsection (b) the following new subsection (a):

''(a) PRESIDENTIAL APPOINTMENT OR DESIGNATION OF CERTAIN CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICERS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—There shall be within each agency listed in section 901(b)(1) of title 31, other than the Department of Defense, an agency Chief Information Officer. Each agency Chief Information Officer shall—

''(A)(i) be appointed by the President; or

''(ii) be designated by the President, in consultation with the head of the agency; and

''(B) be appointed or designated, as applicable, from among individuals who possess demonstrated ability in general management of, and knowledge of and extensive practical experience in, information technology management practices in large governmental or business entities.

''(2) RESPONSIBILITIES.—An agency Chief Information Officer appointed or designated under this section shall report directly to the head of the agency and carry out, on a full-time basis, responsibilities as set forth in this section and in section 3506(a) of title 44 for Chief Information Officers designated under paragraph (2) of such section.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 3506(a)(2)(A) of title 44, United States Code, is amended by inserting after ''each agency'' the following: '', other than an agency with a Presidentially appointed or designated Chief Information Officer as provided in section 11315(a)(1) of title 40,''.

(b) AUTHORITY RELATING TO BUDGET AND PERSONNEL.—Section 11315 of title 40, United States Code, is further amended by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection:

''(d) ADDITIONAL AUTHORITIES FOR CERTAIN CIOS.—

''(1) BUDGET-RELATED AUTHORITY.—

''(A) PLANNING.—The head of each agency listed in section 901(b)(1) or 901(b)(2) of title 31, other than the Department of Defense, shall ensure that the Chief Information Officer of the agency has the authority to participate in decisions regarding the budget planning process related to information technology or programs that include significant information technology components.

''(B) ALLOCATION.—Amounts appropriated for any agency listed in section 901(b)(1) or 901(b)(2) of title 31, other than the Department of Defense, for any fiscal year that are available for information technology shall be allocated within the agency, consistent with the provisions of appropriations Acts and budget guidelines and recommendations from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in such manner as may be specified by, or approved by, the Chief Information Officer of the agency in consultation with the Chief Financial Officer of the agency and budget officials.

''(2) PERSONNEL-RELATED AUTHORITY.—The head of each agency listed in section 901(b)(1) or 901(b)(2) of title 31, other than the Department of Defense, shall ensure that the Chief Information Officer of the agency has the authority necessary to approve the hiring of personnel who will have information technology responsibilities within the agency and to require that such personnel have the obligation to report to the Chief Information Officer in a manner considered sufficient by the Chief Information Officer.''.

(c) SINGLE CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER IN EACH AGENCY.—

(1) REQUIREMENT.—Section 3506(a)(3) of title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by inserting ''(A)'' after ''(3)''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(B) Each agency shall have only one individual with the title and designation of 'Chief Information Officer'. Any bureau, office, or subordinate organization within the agency may designate one individual with the title 'Deputy Chief Information Officer', 'Associate Chief Information Officer', or 'Assistant Chief Information Officer'.''.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 3506(a)(3)(B) of title 44, United States Code, as added by paragraph (1), shall take effect as of October 1, 2014. Any individual serving in a position affected by such section before such date may continue in that position if the requirements of such section are fulfilled with respect to that individual.

SEC. 5102. LEAD COORDINATION ROLE OF CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICERS COUNCIL.

(a) LEAD COORDINATION ROLE.—Subsection (d) of section 3603 of title 44, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(d) LEAD INTERAGENCY FORUM.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Council is designated the lead interagency forum for improving agency coordination of practices related to the design, development, modernization, use, operation, sharing, performance, and review of Federal Government information resources investment. As the lead interagency forum, the Council shall develop cross-agency portfolio management practices to allow and encourage the development of cross-agency shared services and shared platforms. The Council shall also issue guidelines and practices for infrastructure and common information technology applications, including expansion of the Federal Enterprise Architecture process if appropriate. The guidelines and practices may address broader transparency, common inputs, common outputs, and outcomes achieved. The guidelines and practices shall be used as a basis for comparing performance across diverse missions and operations in various agencies.

''(2) REPORT.—Not later than December 1 in each of the 6 years following the date of the enactment of this paragraph, the Council shall submit to the relevant congressional committees a report (to be known as the 'CIO Council Report') summarizing the Council's activities in the preceding fiscal year and containing such recommendations for further congressional action to fulfill its mission as the Council considers appropriate.

''(3) RELEVANT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—For purposes of the report required by paragraph (2), the relevant congressional committees are each of the following:

''(A) The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives.

''(B) The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate.''.

(b) ADDITIONAL FUNCTION.—Subsection (f) of section 3603 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(8) Assist the Administrator in developing and providing guidance for effective operations of the Federal Infrastructure and Common Application Collaboration Center established under section 11501 of title 40.''.

(c) REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATOR OF E-GOVERNMENT AS FEDERAL CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER.—

(1) REFERENCES.—Section 3602(b) of title 44, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following: ''The Administrator may also be referred to as the Federal Chief Information Officer.''.

(2) DEFINITION.—Section 3601(1) of such title is amended by inserting ''or 'Federal Chief Information Officer' '' before ''means''.

SEC. 5103. REPORTS BY GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE.

(a) REQUIREMENT TO EXAMINE EFFECTIVENESS.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall examine the effectiveness of the Chief Information Officers Council in meeting its responsibilities under section 3603(d) of title 44, United States Code, as added by section 5102, with particular focus on—

(1) whether agencies are actively participating in the Council and heeding the Council's advice and guidance; and

(2) whether the Council is actively using and developing the capabilities of the Federal Infrastructure and Common Application Collaboration Center created under section 11501 of title 40, United States Code, as added by section 5401.

(b) REPORTS.—Not later than 1 year, 3 years, and 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to the relevant congressional committees a report containing the findings and recommendations of the Comptroller General from the examination required by subsection (a).

TITLE LII—DATA CENTER OPTIMIZATION

SEC. 5201. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this title is to optimize Federal data center usage and efficiency.

SEC. 5202. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) FEDERAL DATA CENTER OPTIMIZATION INITIATIVE.—The term ''Federal Data Center Optimization Initiative'' or the ''Initiative'' means the initiative developed and implemented by the Director, through the Federal Chief Information Officer, as required under section 5203.

(2) COVERED AGENCY.—The term ''covered agency'' means any agency included in the Federal Data Center Optimization Initiative.

(3) DATA CENTER.—The term ''data center'' means a closet, room, floor, or building for the storage, management, and dissemination

of data and information, as defined by the Federal Chief Information Officer under guidance issued pursuant to this section.

(4) FEDERAL DATA CENTER.—The term ''Federal data center'' means any data center of a covered agency used or operated by a covered agency, by a contractor of a covered agency, or by another organization on behalf of a covered agency.

(5) SERVER UTILIZATION.—The term ''server utilization'' refers to the activity level of a server relative to its maximum activity level, expressed as a percentage.

(6) POWER USAGE EFFECTIVENESS.—The term ''power usage effectiveness'' means the ratio obtained by dividing the total amount of electricity and other power consumed in running a data center by the power consumed by the information and communications technology in the data center.

SEC. 5203. FEDERAL DATA CENTER OPTIMIZATION INITIATIVE.

(a) REQUIREMENT FOR INITIATIVE.—The Federal Chief Information Officer, in consultation with the chief information officers of covered agencies, shall develop and implement an initiative, to be known as the Federal Data Center Optimization Initiative, to optimize the usage and efficiency of Federal data centers by meeting the requirements of this division and taking additional measures, as appropriate.

(b) REQUIREMENT FOR PLAN.—Within 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal Chief Information Officer, in consultation with the chief information officers of covered agencies, shall develop and submit to Congress a plan for implementation of the Initiative required by subsection (a) by each covered agency. In developing the plan, the Federal Chief Information Officer shall take into account the findings and recommendations of the Comptroller General review required by section 5205(e).

(c) MATTERS COVERED.—The plan shall include—

(1) descriptions of how covered agencies will use reductions in floor space, energy use, infrastructure, equipment, applications, personnel, increases in multiorganizational use, server virtualization, cloud computing, and other appropriate methods to meet the requirements of the initiative; and

(2) appropriate consideration of shifting Federally owned data centers to commercially owned data centers.

SEC. 5204. PERFORMANCE REQUIREMENTS RELATED TO DATA CENTER CONSOLIDATION.

(a) SERVER UTILIZATION.—Each covered agency may use the following methods to achieve the maximum server utilization possible as determined by the Federal Chief Information Officer.

(1) The closing of existing data centers that lack adequate server utilization, as determined by the Federal Chief Information Officer. If the agency fails to close such data centers, the agency shall provide a detailed explanation as to why this data center should remain in use as part of the submitted plan. The Federal Chief Information Officer shall include an assessment of the agency explanation in the annual report to Congress.

(2) The consolidation of services within existing data centers to increase server utilization rates.

(3) Any other method that the Federal Chief Information Officer, in consultation with the chief information officers of covered agencies, determines necessary to optimize server utilization.

(b) POWER USAGE EFFECTIVENESS.—Each covered agency may use the following methods to achieve the maximum energy efficiency possible as determined by the Federal Chief Information Officer:

(1) The use of the measurement of power usage effectiveness to calculate data center energy efficiency.

(2) The use of power meters in data centers to frequently measure power consumption over time.

(3) The establishment of power usage effectiveness goals for each data center.

(4) The adoption of best practices for managing—

(A) temperature and airflow in data centers; and

(B) power supply efficiency.

(5) The implementation of any other method that the Federal Chief Information Officer, in consultation with the Chief Information Officers of covered agencies, determines necessary to optimize data center energy efficiency.

SEC. 5205. COST SAVINGS RELATED TO DATA CENTER OPTIMIZATION.

(a) REQUIREMENT TO TRACK COSTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each covered agency shall track costs resulting from implementation of the Federal Data Center Optimization Initiative within the agency and submit a report on those costs annually to the Federal Chief Information Officer. Covered agencies shall determine the net costs from data consolidation on an annual basis.

(2) FACTORS.—In calculating net costs each year under paragraph (1), a covered agency shall use the following factors:

(A) Energy costs.

(B) Personnel costs.

(C) Real estate costs.

(D) Capital expense costs.

(E) Maintenance and support costs such as operating subsystem, database, hardware, and software license expense costs.

(F) Other appropriate costs, as determined by the agency in consultation with the Federal Chief Information Officer.

(b) REQUIREMENT TO TRACK SAVINGS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each covered agency shall track savings resulting from implementation of the Federal Data Center Optimization Initiative within the agency and submit a report on those savings annually to the Federal Chief Information Officer. Covered agencies shall determine the net savings from data consolidation on an annual basis.

(2) FACTORS.—In calculating net savings each year under paragraph (1), a covered agency shall use the following factors:

(A) Energy savings.

(B) Personnel savings.

(C) Real estate savings.

(D) Capital expense savings.

(E) Maintenance and support savings such as operating subsystem, database, hardware, and software license expense savings.

(F) Other appropriate savings, as determined by the agency in consultation with the Federal Chief Information Officer.

(c) REQUIREMENT TO USE COST-EFFECTIVE MEASURES.—Covered agencies shall use the most cost-effective measures to implement the Federal Data Center Optimization Initiative.

(d) USE OF SAVINGS.—Subject to appropriations, any savings resulting from implementation of the Federal Data Center Optimization Initiative within a covered agency shall be used for the following purposes:

(1) To offset the costs of implementing the Initiative within the agency.

(2) To further enhance information technology capabilities and services within the agency.

(e) GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE REVIEW.—Not later than 3 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall examine methods for calculating savings from the Initiative and using them for the purposes identified in subsection (d), including establishment and use of a special revolving fund that supports data centers and server optimization, and shall submit to the Federal Chief Information Officer and Congress a report on the Comptroller General's findings and recommendations.

SEC. 5206. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS TO CONGRESS AND THE FEDERAL CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER.

(a) AGENCY REQUIREMENT TO REPORT TO CIO.—Each year, each covered agency shall submit to the Federal Chief Information Officer a report on the implementation of the Federal Data Center Optimization Initiative, including savings resulting from such implementation. The report shall include an update of the agency's plan for implementing the Initiative.

(b) FEDERAL CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER REQUIREMENT TO REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Each year, the Federal Chief Information Officer shall submit to the relevant congressional committees a report that assesses agency progress in carrying out the Federal Data Center Optimization Initiative and updates the plan under section 5203. The report may be included as part of the annual report required under section 3606 of title 44, United States Code.

TITLE LIII—ELIMINATION OF DUPLICATION AND WASTE IN INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ACQUISITION

SEC. 5301. INVENTORY OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ASSETS.

(a) PLAN.—The Director shall develop a plan for conducting a Governmentwide inventory of information technology assets.

(b) MATTERS COVERED.—The plan required by subsection (a) shall cover the following:

(1) The manner in which Federal agencies can achieve the greatest possible economies of scale and cost savings in the procurement of information technology assets, through measures such as reducing hardware or software products or services that are duplicative or overlapping and reducing the procurement of new software licenses until such time as agency needs exceed the number of existing and unused licenses.

(2) The capability to conduct ongoing Governmentwide inventories of all existing software licenses on an application-by-application basis, including duplicative, unused, overused, and underused licenses, and to assess the need of agencies for software licenses.

(3) A Governmentwide spending analysis to provide knowledge about how much is being spent for software products or services to support decisions for strategic sourcing under the Federal strategic sourcing program managed by the Office of Federal Procurement Policy.

(c) OTHER INVENTORIES.—In developing the plan required by subsection (a), the Director shall review the inventory of information systems maintained by each agency under section 3505(c) of title 44, United States Code, and the inventory of information resources maintained by each agency under section 3506(b)(4) of such title.

(d) AVAILABILITY.—The inventory of information technology assets shall be available to Chief Information Officers and such other Federal officials as the Chief Information Officers may, in consultation with the Chief Information Officers Council, designate.

(e) DEADLINE AND SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director shall complete and submit to Congress the plan required by subsection (a).

(f) IMPLEMENTATION.—Not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director shall complete implementation of the plan required by subsection (a).

(g) REVIEW BY COMPTROLLER GENERAL.—Not later than two years after the date of

the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall review the plan required by subsection (a) and submit to the relevant congressional committees a report on the review.

SEC. 5302. WEBSITE CONSOLIDATION AND TRANSPARENCY.

(a) WEBSITE CONSOLIDATION.—The Director shall—

(1) in consultation with Federal agencies, and after reviewing the directory of public Federal Government websites of each agency (as required to be established and updated under section 207(f)(3) of the E-Government Act of 2002 (Public Law 107–347; 44 U.S.C. 3501 note)), assess all the publicly available websites of Federal agencies to determine whether there are duplicative or overlapping websites; and

(2) require Federal agencies to eliminate or consolidate those websites that are duplicative or overlapping.

(b) WEBSITE TRANSPARENCY.—The Director shall issue guidance to Federal agencies to ensure that the data on publicly available websites of the agencies are open and accessible to the public.

(c) MATTERS COVERED.—In preparing the guidance required by subsection (b), the Director shall—

(1) develop guidelines, standards, and best practices for interoperability and transparency;

(2) identify interfaces that provide for shared, open solutions on the publicly available websites of the agencies; and

(3) ensure that Federal agency Internet home pages, web-based forms, and web-based applications are accessible to individuals with disabilities in conformance with section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 794d).

(d) DEADLINE FOR GUIDANCE.—The guidance required by subsection (b) shall be issued not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 5303. TRANSITION TO THE CLOUD.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that transition to cloud computing offers significant potential benefits for the implementation of Federal information technology projects in terms of flexibility, cost, and operational benefits.

(b) GOVERNMENTWIDE APPLICATION.—In assessing cloud computing opportunities, the Chief Information Officers Council shall define policies and guidelines for the adoption of Governmentwide programs providing for a standardized approach to security assessment and operational authorization for cloud products and services.

(c) ADDITIONAL BUDGET AUTHORITIES FOR TRANSITION.—In transitioning to the cloud, a Chief Information Officer of an agency listed in section 901(b) of title 31, United States Code, may establish such cloud service Working Capital Funds, in consultation with the Chief Financial Officer of the agency, as may be necessary to transition to cloud-based solutions. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, such cloud service Working Capital Funds may preserve funding for cloud service transitions for a period not to exceed 5 years per appropriation. Any establishment of a new Working Capital Fund under this subsection shall be reported to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate and relevant Congressional committees.

SEC. 5304. ELIMINATION OF UNNECESSARY DUPLICATION OF CONTRACTS BY REQUIRING BUSINESS CASE ANALYSIS.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to leverage the Government's buying power and achieve administrative efficiencies and cost savings by eliminating unnecessary duplication of contracts.

(b) REQUIREMENT FOR BUSINESS CASE APPROVAL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Effective on and after 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, an executive agency may not issue a solicitation for a covered contract vehicle unless the agency performs a business case analysis for the contract vehicle and obtains an approval of the business case analysis from the Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy.

(2) REVIEW OF BUSINESS CASE ANALYSIS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—With respect to any covered contract vehicle, the Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy shall review the business case analysis submitted for the contract vehicle and provide an approval or disapproval within 60 days after the date of submission. Any business case analysis not disapproved within such 60-day period is deemed to be approved.

(B) BASIS FOR APPROVAL OF BUSINESS CASE.—The Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy shall approve or disapprove a business case analysis based on the adequacy of the analysis submitted. The Administrator shall give primary consideration to whether an agency has demonstrated a compelling need that cannot be satisfied by existing Governmentwide contract vehicles in a timely and cost-effective manner.

(3) CONTENT OF BUSINESS CASE ANALYSIS.—The Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy shall issue guidance specifying the content for a business case analysis submitted pursuant to this section. At a minimum, the business case analysis shall include details on the administrative resources needed for such contract vehicle, including an analysis of all direct and indirect costs to the Federal Government of awarding and administering such contract vehicle and the impact such contract vehicle will have on the ability of the Federal Government to leverage its purchasing power.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—

(1) COVERED CONTRACT VEHICLE.—The term ''covered contract vehicle'' has the meaning provided by the Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy in guidance issued pursuant to this section and includes, at a minimum, any Governmentwide contract vehicle, whether for acquisition of information technology or other goods or services, in an amount greater than $50,000,000 (or $10,000,000, determined on an average annual basis, in the case of such a contract vehicle performed over more than one year). The term does not include a multiple award schedule contract awarded by the General Services Administration, a Governmentwide acquisition contract for information technology awarded pursuant to sections 11302(e) and 11314(a)(2) of title 40, United States Code, or orders against existing Governmentwide contract vehicles.

(2) GOVERNMENTWIDE CONTRACT VEHICLE AND EXECUTIVE AGENCY.—The terms ''Governmentwide contract vehicle'' and ''executive agency'' have the meanings provided in section 11501 of title 40, United States Code, as added by section 5401.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than June 1 in each of the next 6 years following the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy shall submit to the relevant congressional committees a report on the implementation of this section, including a summary of the submissions, reviews, approvals, and disapprovals of business case analyses pursuant to this section.

(e) GUIDANCE.—The Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy shall issue guidance for implementing this section.

(f) REVISION OF FAR.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal Acquisition Regulation shall be amended to implement this section.

TITLE LIV—STRENGTHENING AND STREAMLINING INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT PRACTICES

Subtitle A—Strengthening and Streamlining IT Program Management Practices

SEC. 5401. ESTABLISHMENT OF FEDERAL INFRASTRUCTURE AND COMMON APPLICATION COLLABORATION CENTER.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 115 of title 40, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''CHAPTER 115—INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT PRACTICES

''§ 11501. Federal infrastructure and common application collaboration center

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT AND PURPOSES.—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall establish a Federal Infrastructure and Common Application Collaboration Center (hereafter in this section referred to as the 'Collaboration Center') within the Office of Electronic Government established under section 3602 of title 44 in accordance with this section. The purposes of the Collaboration Center are to serve as a focal point for coordinated program management practices and to develop and maintain requirements for the acquisition of IT infrastructure and common applications commonly used by various Federal agencies.

''(b) ORGANIZATION OF CENTER.—

''(1) MEMBERSHIP.—The Center shall consist of the following members:

''(A) An appropriate number, as determined by the CIO Council, but not less than 12, full-time program managers or cost specialists, all of whom have appropriate experience in the private or Government sector in managing or overseeing acquisitions of IT infrastructure and common applications.

''(B) At least 1 full-time detailee from each of the Federal agencies listed in section 901(b) of title 31, nominated by the respective agency chief information officer for a detail period of not less than 2 years.

''(2) WORKING GROUPS.—The Collaboration Center shall have working groups that specialize in IT infrastructure and common applications identified by the CIO Council. Each working group shall be headed by a separate dedicated program manager appointed by the Federal Chief Information Officer.

''(c) CAPABILITIES AND FUNCTIONS OF THE COLLABORATION CENTER.—For each of the IT infrastructure and common application areas identified by the CIO Council, the Collaboration Center shall perform the following roles, and any other functions as directed by the Federal Chief Information Officer:

''(1) Develop, maintain, and disseminate requirements suitable to establish contracts that will meet the common and general needs of various Federal agencies as determined by the Center. In doing so, the Center shall give maximum consideration to the adoption of commercial standards and industry acquisition best practices, including opportunities for shared services, consideration of total cost of ownership, preference for industry-neutral functional specifications leveraging open industry standards and competition, and use of long-term contracts, as appropriate.

''(2) Develop, maintain, and disseminate reliable cost estimates that are accurate, comprehensive, well-documented, and credible.

''(3) Lead the review of significant or troubled IT investments or acquisitions as identified by the CIO Council.

''(4) Provide expert aid to troubled IT investments or acquisitions.

''(d) GUIDANCE.—The Director, in consultation with the Chief Information Officers Council, shall issue guidance addressing the scope and operation of the Collaboration Center. The guidance shall require that the Collaboration Center report to the Federal Chief Information Officer.

''(e) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall annually submit to the relevant congressional committees a report detailing the organization, staff, and activities of the Collaboration Center, including—

''(A) a list of IT infrastructure and common applications the Center assisted;

''(B) an assessment of the Center's achievement in promoting efficiency, shared services, and elimination of unnecessary Government requirements that are contrary to commercial best practices; and

''(C) the use and expenditure of amounts in the Fund established under subsection (i).

''(2) INCLUSION IN OTHER REPORT.—The report may be included as part of the annual E-Government status report required under section 3606 of title 44.

''(f) IMPROVEMENT OF THE GOVERNMENTWIDE SOFTWARE PURCHASING PROGRAM.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Collaboration Center, in collaboration with the Office of Federal Procurement Policy, the Department of Defense, and the General Services Administration, shall identify and develop a strategic sourcing initiative to enhance Governmentwide acquisition, shared use, and dissemination of software, as well as compliance with end user license agreements.

''(2) EXAMINATION OF METHODS.—In developing the initiative under paragraph (1), the Collaboration Center shall examine the use of realistic and effective demand aggregation models supported by actual agency commitment to use the models, and supplier relationship management practices, to more effectively govern the Government's acquisition of information technology.

''(3) GOVERNMENTWIDE USER LICENSE AGREEMENT.—The Collaboration Center, in developing the initiative under paragraph (1), shall allow for the purchase of a license agreement that is available for use by all executive agencies as one user to the maximum extent practicable and as appropriate.

''(g) GUIDELINES FOR ACQUISITION OF IT INFRASTRUCTURE AND COMMON APPLICATIONS.—

''(1) GUIDELINES.—The Collaboration Center shall establish guidelines that, to the maximum extent possible, eliminate inconsistent practices among executive agencies and ensure uniformity and consistency in acquisition processes for IT infrastructure and common applications across the Federal Government.

''(2) CENTRAL WEBSITE.—In preparing the guidelines, the Collaboration Center, in consultation with the Chief Acquisition Officers Council, shall offer executive agencies the option of accessing a central website for best practices, templates, and other relevant information.

''(h) PRICING TRANSPARENCY.—The Collaboration Center, in collaboration with the Office of Federal Procurement Policy, the Chief Acquisition Officers Council, the General Services Administration, and the Assisted Acquisition Centers of Excellence, shall compile a price list and catalogue containing current pricing information by vendor for each of its IT infrastructure and common applications categories. The price catalogue shall contain any price provided by a vendor for the same or similar good or service to any executive agency. The catalogue shall be developed in a fashion ensuring that it may be used for pricing comparisons and pricing analysis using standard data formats. The price catalogue shall not be made public, but shall be accessible to executive agencies.

''(i) FEDERAL IT ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENT FUND.—

''(1) ESTABLISHMENT AND MANAGEMENT OF FUND.—There is a Federal IT Acquisition Management Improvement Fund (in this subsection referred to as the 'Fund'). The Administrator of General Services shall manage the Fund through the Collaboration Center to support the activities of the Collaboration Center carried out pursuant to this section. The Administrator of General Services shall consult with the Director in managing the Fund.

''(2) CREDITS TO FUND.—Five percent of the fees collected by executive agencies under the following contracts shall be credited to the Fund:

''(A) Governmentwide task and delivery order contracts entered into under sections 4103 and 4105 of title 41.

''(B) Governmentwide contracts for the acquisition of information technology and multiagency acquisition contracts for that technology authorized by section 11314 of this title.

''(C) Multiple-award schedule contracts entered into by the Administrator of General Services.

''(3) REMITTANCE BY HEAD OF EXECUTIVE AGENCY.—The head of an executive agency that administers a contract described in paragraph (2) shall remit to the General Services Administration the amount required to be credited to the Fund with respect to the contract at the end of each quarter of the fiscal year.

''(4) AMOUNTS NOT TO BE USED FOR OTHER PURPOSES.—The Administrator of General Services, through the Office of Management and Budget, shall ensure that amounts collected under this subsection are not used for a purpose other than the activities of the Collaboration Center carried out pursuant to this section.

''(5) AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNTS.—Amounts credited to the Fund remain available to be expended only in the fiscal year for which they are credited and the 4 succeeding fiscal years.

''(j) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) EXECUTIVE AGENCY.—The term 'executive agency' has the meaning provided that term by section 105 of title 5.

''(2) FEDERAL CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER.—The term 'Federal Chief Information Officer' means the Administrator of the Office of Electronic Government established under section 3602 of title 44.

''(3) GOVERNMENTWIDE CONTRACT VEHICLE.—The term 'Governmentwide contract vehicle' means any contract, blanket purchase agreement, or other contractual instrument that allows for an indefinite number of orders to be placed within the contract, agreement, or instrument, and that is established by one executive agency for use by multiple executive agencies to obtain supplies and services.

''(4) RELEVANT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term 'relevant congressional committees' means each of the following:

''(A) The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives.

''(B) The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate.

''(k) REVISION OF FAR.—The Federal Acquisition Regulation shall be amended to implement this section.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The item relating to chapter 115 in the table of chapters at the beginning of subtitle III of title 40, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''115. Information Technology Acquisition Management Practices ..... 11501''.

(b) DEADLINES.—

(1) Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director shall issue guidance under section 11501(d) of title 40, United States Code, as added by subsection (a).

(2) Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director shall establish the Federal Infrastructure and Common Application Collaboration Center, in accordance with section 11501(a) of such title, as so added.

(3) Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal Infrastructure and Common Application Collaboration Center shall—

(A) identify and develop a strategic sourcing initiative in accordance with section 11501(f) of such title, as so added; and

(B) establish guidelines in accordance with section 11501(g) of such title, as so added.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 3602(c) of title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (2);

(2) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph (3):

''(3) all of the functions of the Federal Infrastructure and Common Application Collaboration Center, as required under section 11501 of title 40; and''.

SEC. 5402. DESIGNATION OF ASSISTED ACQUISITION CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—Chapter 115 of title 40, United States Code, as amended by section 5401, is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 11502. Assisted Acquisition Centers of Excellence

''(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to develop specialized assisted acquisition centers of excellence within the Federal Government to promote—

''(1) the effective use of best acquisition practices;

''(2) the development of specialized expertise in the acquisition of information technology; and

''(3) Governmentwide sharing of acquisition capability to augment any shortage in the information technology acquisition workforce.

''(b) DESIGNATION OF AACEs.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this section, and every 3 years thereafter, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in consultation with the Chief Acquisition Officers Council and the Chief Information Officers Council, shall designate, redesignate, or withdraw the designation of acquisition centers of excellence within various executive agencies to carry out the functions set forth in subsection (c) in an area of specialized acquisition expertise as determined by the Director. Each such center of excellence shall be known as an 'Assisted Acquisition Center of Excellence' or an 'AACE'.

''(c) FUNCTIONS.—The functions of each AACE are as follows:

''(1) BEST PRACTICES.—To promote, develop, and implement the use of best acquisition practices in the area of specialized acquisition expertise that the AACE is designated to carry out by the Director under subsection (b).

''(2) ASSISTED ACQUISITIONS.—To assist all Government agencies in the expedient and low-cost acquisition of the information technology goods or services covered by such area of specialized acquisition expertise by

engaging in repeated and frequent acquisition of similar information technology requirements.

''(3) DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING OF IT ACQUISITION WORKFORCE.—To assist in recruiting and training IT acquisition cadres (referred to in section 1704(j) of title 41).

''(d) CRITERIA.—In designating, redesignating, or withdrawing the designation of an AACE, the Director shall consider, at a minimum, the following matters:

''(1) The subject matter expertise of the host agency in a specific area of information technology acquisition.

''(2) For acquisitions of IT infrastructure and common applications covered by the Federal Infrastructure and Common Application Collaboration Center established under section 11501 of this title, the ability and willingness to collaborate with the Collaboration Center and adhere to the requirements standards established by the Collaboration Center.

''(3) The ability of an AACE to develop customized requirements documents that meet the needs of executive agencies as well as the current industry standards and commercial best practices.

''(4) The ability of an AACE to consistently award and manage various contracts, task or delivery orders, and other acquisition arrangements in a timely, cost-effective, and compliant manner.

''(5) The ability of an AACE to aggregate demands from multiple executive agencies for similar information technology goods or services and fulfill those demands in one acquisition.

''(6) The ability of an AACE to acquire innovative or emerging commercial and noncommercial technologies using various contracting methods, including ways to lower the entry barriers for small businesses with limited Government contracting experiences.

''(7) The ability of an AACE to maximize commercial item acquisition, effectively manage high-risk contract types, increase competition, promote small business participation, and maximize use of available Governmentwide contract vehicles.

''(8) The existence of an in-house cost estimating group with expertise to consistently develop reliable cost estimates that are accurate, comprehensive, well-documented, and credible.

''(9) The ability of an AACE to employ best practices and educate requesting agencies, to the maximum extent practicable, regarding critical factors underlying successful major IT acquisitions, including the following factors:

''(A) Active engagement by program officials with stakeholders.

''(B) Possession by program staff of the necessary knowledge and skills.

''(C) Support of the programs by senior department and agency executives.

''(D) Involvement by end users and stakeholders in the development of requirements.

''(E) Participation by end users in testing of system functionality prior to formal end user acceptance testing.

''(F) Stability and consistency of Government and contractor staff.

''(G) Prioritization of requirements by program staff.

''(H) Maintenance of regular communication with the prime contractor by program officials.

''(I) Receipt of sufficient funding by programs.

''(10) The ability of an AACE to run an effective acquisition intern program in collaboration with the Federal Acquisition Institute or the Defense Acquisition University.

''(11) The ability of an AACE to effectively and properly manage fees received for assisted acquisitions pursuant to this section.

''(e) FUNDS RECEIVED BY AACEs.—

''(1) AVAILABILITY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law or regulation, funds obligated and transferred from an executive agency in a fiscal year to an AACE for the acquisition of goods or services covered by an area of specialized acquisition expertise of an AACE, regardless of whether the requirements are severable or non-severable, shall remain available for awards of contracts by the AACE for the same general requirements for the next 5 fiscal years following the fiscal year in which the funds were transferred.

''(2) TRANSITION TO NEW AACE.—If the AACE to which the funds are provided under paragraph (1) becomes unable to fulfill the requirements of the executive agency from which the funds were provided, the funds may be provided to a different AACE to fulfill such requirements. The funds so provided shall be used for the same purpose and remain available for the same period of time as applied when provided to the original AACE.

''(3) RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING AUTHORITIES.—This subsection does not limit any existing authorities an AACE may have under its revolving or working capital funds authorities.

''(f) GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE REVIEW OF AACE.—

''(1) REVIEW.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall review and assess—

''(A) the use and management of fees received by the AACEs pursuant to this section to ensure that an appropriate fee structure is established and enforced to cover activities addressed in this section and that no excess fees are charged or retained; and

''(B) the effectiveness of the AACEs in achieving the purpose described in subsection (a), including review of contracts.

''(2) REPORTS.—Not later than 1 year after the designation or redesignation of AACES under subsection (b), the Comptroller General shall submit to the relevant congressional committees a report containing the findings and assessment under paragraph (1).

''(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) ASSISTED ACQUISITION.—The term 'assisted acquisition' means a type of interagency acquisition in which the parties enter into an interagency agreement pursuant to which—

''(A) the servicing agency performs acquisition activities on the requesting agency's behalf, such as awarding, administering, or closing out a contract, task order, delivery order, or blanket purchase agreement; and

''(B) funding is provided through a franchise fund, the Acquisition Services Fund in section 321 of this title, sections 1535 and 1536 of title 31, or other available methods.

''(2) EXECUTIVE AGENCY.—The term 'executive agency' has the meaning provided that term by section 133 of title 41.

''(3) RELEVANT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term 'relevant congressional committees' has the meaning provided that term by section 11501 of this title.

''(h) REVISION OF FAR.—The Federal Acquisition Regulation shall be amended to implement this section.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 115 of title 40, United States Code, as amended by section 5401, is further amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''11502. Assisted Acquisition Centers of Excellence.''.

Subtitle B—Strengthening IT Acquisition Workforce

SEC. 5411. EXPANSION OF TRAINING AND USE OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ACQUISITION CADRES.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to ensure timely progress by Federal agencies toward developing, strengthening, and deploying personnel with highly specialized skills in information technology acquisition, including program and project managers, to be known as information technology acquisition cadres.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Section 1704 of title 41, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(j) STRATEGIC PLAN ON INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ACQUISITION CADRES.—

''(1) FIVE-YEAR STRATEGIC PLAN TO CONGRESS.—Not later than June 1 following the date of the enactment of this subsection, the Director shall submit to the relevant congressional committees a 5-year strategic plan (to be known as the 'IT Acquisition Cadres Strategic Plan') to develop, strengthen, and solidify information technology acquisition cadres. The plan shall include a timeline for implementation of the plan and identification of individuals responsible for specific elements of the plan during the 5-year period covered by the plan.

''(2) MATTERS COVERED.—The plan shall address, at a minimum, the following matters:

''(A) Current information technology acquisition staffing challenges in Federal agencies, by previous year's information technology acquisition value, and by the Federal Government as a whole.

''(B) The variety and complexity of information technology acquisitions conducted by each Federal agency covered by the plan, and the specialized information technology acquisition workforce needed to effectively carry out such acquisitions.

''(C) The development of a sustainable funding model to support efforts to hire, retain, and train an information technology acquisition cadre of appropriate size and skill to effectively carry out the acquisition programs of the Federal agencies covered by the plan, including an examination of interagency funding methods and a discussion of how the model of the Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund could be applied to civilian agencies.

''(D) Any strategic human capital planning necessary to hire, retain, and train an information acquisition cadre of appropriate size and skill at each Federal agency covered by the plan.

''(E) Governmentwide training standards and certification requirements necessary to enhance the mobility and career opportunities of the Federal information technology acquisition cadre within the Federal agencies covered by the plan.

''(F) New and innovative approaches to workforce development and training, including cross-functional training, rotational development, and assignments both within and outside the Government.

''(G) Appropriate consideration and alignment with the needs and priorities of the Infrastructure and Common Application Collaboration Center, Assisted Acquisition Centers of Excellence, and acquisition intern programs.

''(H) Assessment of the current workforce competency and usage trends in evaluation technique to obtain best value, including proper handling of tradeoffs between price and nonprice factors.

''(I) Assessment of the current workforce competency in designing and aligning performance goals, life cycle costs, and contract incentives.

''(J) Assessment of the current workforce competency in avoiding brand-name preference and using industry-neutral functional specifications to leverage open industry standards and competition.

''(K) Use of integrated program teams, including fully dedicated program managers, for each complex information technology investment.

''(L) Proper assignment of recognition or accountability to the members of an integrated program team for both individual functional goals and overall program success or failure.

''(M) The development of a technology fellows program that includes provisions for recruiting, for rotation of assignments, and for partnering directly with universities with well-recognized information technology programs.

''(N) The capability to properly manage other transaction authority (where such authority is granted), including ensuring that the use of the authority is warranted due to unique technical challenges, rapid adoption of innovative or emerging commercial or noncommercial technologies, or other circumstances that cannot readily be satisfied using a contract, grant, or cooperative agreement in accordance with applicable law and the Federal Acquisition Regulation.

''(O) The use of student internship and scholarship programs as a talent pool for permanent hires and the use and impact of special hiring authorities and flexibilities to recruit diverse candidates.

''(P) The assessment of hiring manager satisfaction with the hiring process and hiring outcomes, including satisfaction with the quality of applicants interviewed and hires made.

''(Q) The assessment of applicant satisfaction with the hiring process, including the clarity of the hiring announcement, the user-friendliness of the application process, communication from the hiring manager or agency regarding application status, and timeliness of the hiring decision.

''(R) The assessment of new hire satisfaction with the onboarding process, including the orientation process, and investment in training and development for employees during their first year of employment.

''(S) Any other matters the Director considers appropriate.

''(3) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than June 1 in each of the 5 years following the year of submission of the plan required by paragraph (1), the Director shall submit to the relevant congressional committees an annual report outlining the progress made pursuant to the plan.

''(4) GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE REVIEW OF THE PLAN AND ANNUAL REPORT.—

''(A) Not later than 1 year after the submission of the plan required by paragraph (1), the Comptroller General of the United States shall review the plan and submit to the relevant congressional committees a report on the review.

''(B) Not later than 6 months after the submission of the first, third, and fifth annual report required under paragraph (3), the Comptroller General shall independently assess the findings of the annual report and brief the relevant congressional committees on the Comptroller General's findings and recommendations to ensure the objectives of the plan are accomplished.

''(5) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

''(A) The term 'Federal agency' means each agency listed in section 901(b) of title 31.

''(B) The term 'relevant congressional committees' means each of the following:

''(i) The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives.

''(ii) The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate.''.

SEC. 5412. PLAN ON STRENGTHENING PROGRAM AND PROJECT MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE.

(a) PLAN ON STRENGTHENING PROGRAM AND PROJECT MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE.—Not later than June 1 following the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director, in consultation with the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, shall submit to the relevant congressional committees a plan for improving management of IT programs and projects.

(b) MATTERS COVERED.—The plan required by subsection (a) shall include, at a minimum, the following:

(1) Creation of a specialized career path for program management.

(2) The development of a competency model for program management consistent with the IT project manager model.

(3) A career advancement model that requires appropriate expertise and experience for advancement.

(4) A career advancement model that is more competitive with the private sector and that recognizes both Government and private sector experience.

(5) Appropriate consideration and alignment with the needs and priorities of the Infrastructure and Common Application Collaboration Center, the Assisted Acquisition Centers of Excellence, and acquisition intern programs.

(c) COMBINATION WITH OTHER CADRES PLAN.—The Director may combine the plan required by subsection (a) with the IT Acquisition Cadres Strategic Plan required under section 1704(j) of title 41, United States Code, as added by section 411.

SEC. 5413. PERSONNEL AWARDS FOR EXCELLENCE IN THE ACQUISITION OF INFORMATION SYSTEMS AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall develop policy and guidance for agencies to develop a program to recognize excellent performance by Federal Government employees and teams of such employees in the acquisition of information systems and information technology for the agency.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The program referred to in subsection (a) shall, to the extent practicable—

(1) obtain objective outcome measures; and

(2) include procedures for—

(A) the nomination of Federal Government employees and teams of such employees for eligibility for recognition under the program; and

(B) the evaluation of nominations for recognition under the program by 1 or more agency panels of individuals from Government, academia, and the private sector who have such expertise, and are appointed in such a manner, as the Director of the Office of Personal Management shall establish for purposes of the program.

(c) AWARD OF CASH BONUSES AND OTHER INCENTIVES.—In carrying out the program referred to in subsection (a), the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, in consultation with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, shall establish policies and guidance for agencies to reward any Federal Government employee or teams of such employees recognized pursuant to the program—

(1) with a cash bonus, to the extent that the performance of such individual or team warrants the award of such bonus and is authorized by any provision of law;

(2) through promotions and other nonmonetary awards;

(3) by publicizing—

(A) acquisition accomplishments by individual employees; and

(B) the tangible end benefits that resulted from such accomplishments, as appropriate; and

(4) through other awards, incentives, or bonuses that the head of the agency considers appropriate.

TITLE LV—ADDITIONAL REFORMS

SEC. 5501. MAXIMIZING THE BENEFIT OF THE FEDERAL STRATEGIC SOURCING INITIATIVE.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy shall prescribe regulations providing that when the Federal Government makes a purchase of services and supplies offered under the Federal Strategic Sourcing Initiative (managed by the Office of Federal Procurement Policy) but such Initiative is not used, the contract file for the purchase shall include a brief analysis of the comparative value, including price and nonprice factors, between the services and supplies offered under such Initiative and services and supplies offered under the source or sources used for the purchase.

SEC. 5502. PROMOTING TRANSPARENCY OF BLANKET PURCHASE AGREEMENTS.

(a) PRICE INFORMATION TO BE TREATED AS PUBLIC INFORMATION.—The final negotiated price offered by an awardee of a blanket purchase agreement shall be treated as public information.

(b) PUBLICATION OF BLANKET PURCHASE AGREEMENT INFORMATION.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of General Services shall make available to the public a list of all blanket purchase agreements entered into by Federal agencies under its Federal Supply Schedules contracts and the prices associated with those blanket purchase agreements. The list and price information shall be updated at least once every 6 months.

SEC. 5503. ADDITIONAL SOURCE SELECTION TECHNIQUE IN SOLICITATIONS.

Section 3306(d) of title 41, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''or'' at the end of paragraph (1);

(2) by striking the period and inserting ''; or'' at the end of paragraph (2); and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) stating in the solicitation that the award will be made using a fixed price technical competition, under which all offerors compete solely on nonprice factors and the fixed award price is pre-announced in the solicitation.''.

SEC. 5504. ENHANCED TRANSPARENCY IN INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY INVESTMENTS.

(a) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION ABOUT IT INVESTMENTS.—Section 11302(c) of title 40, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraph:

''(2) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall make available to the public the cost, schedule, and performance data for at least 80 percent (by dollar value) of all information technology investments Governmentwide, and 60 percent (by dollar value) of all information technology investments in each Federal agency listed in section 901(b) of title 31, notwithstanding whether the investments are for new IT acquisitions or for operations and maintenance of existing IT. The Director shall ensure that the information is current, accurate, and reflects the risks associated

with each covered information technology investment.

''(B) WAIVER OR LIMITATION AUTHORITY.—The applicability of subparagraph (A) may be waived or the extent of the information may be limited—

''(i) by the Director, with respect to IT investments Governmentwide; and

''(ii) by the Chief Information Officer of a Federal agency, with respect to IT investments in that agency;

if the Director or the Chief Information Officer, as the case may be, determines that such a waiver or limitation is in the national security interests of the United States.''.

(b) ADDITIONAL REPORT REQUIREMENTS.—Paragraph (3) of section 11302(c) of such title, as redesignated by subsection (a), is amended by adding at the end the following: ''The report shall include an analysis of agency trends reflected in the performance risk information required in paragraph (2).''.

SEC. 5505. ENHANCED COMMUNICATION BETWEEN GOVERNMENT AND INDUSTRY.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal Acquisition Regulatory Council shall prescribe a regulation making clear that agency acquisition personnel are permitted and encouraged to engage in responsible and constructive exchanges with industry, so long as those exchanges are consistent with existing law and regulation and do not promote an unfair competitive advantage to particular firms.

SEC. 5506. CLARIFICATION OF CURRENT LAW WITH RESPECT TO TECHNOLOGY NEUTRALITY IN ACQUISITION OF SOFTWARE.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to establish guidance and processes to clarify that software acquisitions by the Federal Government are to be made using merit-based requirements development and evaluation processes that promote procurement choices—

(1) based on performance and value, including the long-term value proposition to the Federal Government;

(2) free of preconceived preferences based on how technology is developed, licensed, or distributed; and

(3) generally including the consideration of proprietary, open source, and mixed source software technologies.

(b) TECHNOLOGY NEUTRALITY.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to modify the Federal Government's long-standing policy of following technology-neutral principles and practices when selecting and acquiring information technology that best fits the needs of the Federal Government.

(c) GUIDANCE.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director, in consultation with the Chief Information Officers Council, shall issue guidance concerning the technology-neutral procurement and use of software within the Federal Government.

(d) MATTERS COVERED.—In issuing guidance under subsection (c), the Director shall include, at a minimum, the following:

(1) Guidance to clarify that the preference for commercial items in section 3307 of title 41, United States Code, includes proprietary, open source, and mixed source software that meets the definition of the term ''commercial item'' in section 103 of title 41, United States Code, including all such software that is used for non-Government purposes and is licensed to the public.

(2) Guidance regarding the conduct of market research to ensure the inclusion of proprietary, open source, and mixed source software options.

(3) Guidance to define Governmentwide standards for security, redistribution, indemnity, and copyright in the acquisition, use, release, and collaborative development of proprietary, open source, and mixed source software.

(4) Guidance for the adoption of available commercial practices to acquire proprietary, open source, and mixed source software for widespread Government use, including issues such as security and redistribution rights.

(5) Guidance to establish standard service level agreements for maintenance and support for proprietary, open source, and mixed source software products widely adopted by the Government, as well as the development of Governmentwide agreements that contain standard and widely applicable contract provisions for ongoing maintenance and development of software.

(6) Guidance on the role and use of the Federal Infrastructure and Common Application Collaboration Center, established pursuant to section 11501 of title 40, United States Code (as added by section 5401), for acquisition of proprietary, open source, and mixed source software.

(e) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 2 years after the issuance of the guidance required by subsection (b), the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the relevant congressional committees a report containing—

(1) an assessment of the effectiveness of the guidance;

(2) an identification of barriers to widespread use by the Federal Government of specific software technologies; and

(3) such legislative recommendations as the Comptroller General considers appropriate to further the purposes of this section.

AMENDMENT NO. 170 OFFERED BY MR. GARAMENDI OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of subtitle C of title XV, add the following new section:

SEC. 15__. LIMITATION ON FUNDS FOR THE AFGHANISTAN SECURITY FORCES FUND TO ACQUIRE CERTAIN AIRCRAFT, VEHICLES, AND EQUIPMENT.

(a) LIMITATION.—Of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act to the Department of Defense for the Afghanistan Security Forces Fund (ASFF), $2,600,000,000 shall be withheld from obligation and expenditure until the Secretary of Defense submits to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate a report as described in subsection (b).

(b) REPORT.—The report referred to in subsection (a) is a report that includes the following information:

(1) A list of all covered aircraft, vehicles, and equipment to be purchased with funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act to the Department of Defense for the ASFF.

(2) The expected date on which such covered aircraft, vehicles, and equipment would be delivered and operable in Afghanistan.

(3) The full requirements for operating such covered aircraft, vehicles, and equipment.

(4) The plan for maintenance of such covered aircraft, vehicles, and equipment and estimated costs of such covered aircraft, vehicles, and equipment by year, through 2020.

(5) The expected date that ASFF personnel would be fully capable of operating and maintaining such covered aircraft, vehicles, and equipment without support from United States personnel.

(6) An explanation of the extent to which the acquisition of such covered aircraft, vehicles, and equipment will impact the longer-term United States costs of supporting the ASFF.

(c) COVERED AIRCRAFT, VEHICLES, AND EQUIPMENT.—In this section, the term ''covered aircraft, vehicles, and equipment'' means helicopters, systems for close air support, air mobility systems, and armored vehicles.

AMENDMENT NO. 171 OFFERED BY MR. GINGREY OF GEORGIA

At the end of subtitle I of title X of division A, add the following:

SEC. 1090. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING PRESERVATION OF SECOND AMENDMENT RIGHTS OF ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY PERSONNEL STATIONED OR RESIDING IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The Second Amendment to the United States Constitution provides that the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed.

(2) Approximately 40,000 servicemen and women across all branches of the Armed Forces either live in or are stationed on active duty within the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area. Unless these individuals are granted a waiver as serving in a law enforcement role, they are subject to the District of Columbia's onerous and highly restrictive laws on the possession of firearms.

(3) Military personnel, despite being extensively trained in the proper and safe use of firearms, are therefore deprived by the laws of the District of Columbia of handguns, rifles, and shotguns that are commonly kept by law-abiding persons throughout the United States for sporting use and for lawful defense of their persons, homes, businesses, and families.

(4) The District of Columbia has one of the highest per capita murder rates in the Nation, which may be attributed in part to previous local laws prohibiting possession of firearms by law-abiding persons who would have otherwise been able to defend themselves and their loved ones in their own homes and businesses.

(5) The Gun Control Act of 1968 (as amended by the Firearms Owners' Protection Act) and the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act provide comprehensive Federal regulations applicable in the District of Columbia as elsewhere. In addition, existing District of Columbia criminal laws punish possession and illegal use of firearms by violent criminals and felons. Consequently, there is no need for local laws that only affect and disarm law-abiding citizens.

(6) On June 26, 2008, the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *District of Columbia v. Heller* held that the Second Amendment protects an individual's right to possess a firearm for traditionally lawful purposes, and thus ruled that the District of Columbia's handgun ban and requirements that rifles and shotguns in the home be kept unloaded and disassembled or outfitted with a trigger lock to be unconstitutional.

(7) On July 16, 2008, the District of Columbia enacted the Firearms Control Emergency Amendment Act of 2008 (D.C. Act 17-422; 55 DCR 8237), which places onerous restrictions on the ability of law-abiding citizens from possessing firearms, thus violating the spirit by which the Supreme Court of the United States ruled in *District of Columbia v. Heller*.

(8) On February 26, 2009, the United States Senate adopted an amendment on a bipartisan vote of 62-36 by Senator John Ensign to S. 160, the District of Columbia House Voting Rights Act of 2009, which would fully restore Second Amendment rights to the citizens of the District of Columbia.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that active duty military personnel who are stationed or residing in the District of Columbia should be permitted to exercise fully their rights under the Second Amendment to the Constitution of the United States and therefore should be exempt from

the District of Columbia's restrictions on the possession of firearms.

AMENDMENT NO. 172 OFFERED BY MRS. DAVIS OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of subtitle A of title VI, add the following new section:

SEC. 6___. RECOGNITION OF ADDITIONAL MEANS BY WHICH MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL GUARD CALLED INTO FEDERAL SERVICE FOR A PERIOD OF 30 DAYS OR LESS MAY INITIALLY REPORT FOR DUTY FOR ENTITLEMENT TO BASIC PAY.

Section 204(c) of title 37, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking ''date when he appears at the place of company rendezvous'' and inserting ''date on which the member, in person or by authorized telephonic or electronic means, contacts the member's unit''; and

(2) by striking the second sentence and inserting the following new sentence: ''However, this subsection does not authorize any expenditure before the member makes authorized contact that is not authorized by law to be paid after such authorized contact.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chair, I urge the committee to adopt the amendments en bloc, all of which have been examined by both the majority and the minority.

At this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA).

Mr. ISSA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

My amendment is not controversial, but it's critical. At a time when over $80 billion is spent and over 10 percent of it goes completely wasted on information technology purchases by the government, there has never been a more important time to update the legendary, historic Clinger-Cohen Act. That Act in 1996 was attached to the NDAA, exactly as this one is, and it created the positions of Chief Information Officers to oversee IT management.

□ 1040

1996 was a time in which you could still have an IBM AT 286 computer on your desk. The idea of cloud servers didn't exist, and the size and scope and dependency on the cyber environment was never even anticipated.

So as we modernize this act, I would ask to both have it considered as important, but also have it recognized as critically necessary.

One of the most important things and something that makes common sense to the people who may hear this today or read it in the transcript is that we have more chief information officers today than we have departments, and all but one have no budget authority.

This legislation, when enacted, will eliminate that. It will eliminate duplicative IT purchases that give us overruns of as much as 20 percent in our purchasing of licenses, but it also will put real meaning behind the term ''chief information officer.'' Never again will someone have that title and have no budget authority or responsibility. When a program goes right, the chief information officer is responsible; when a program goes awry, it's his or her job to make it right.

Once again, I urge support for a bill that was considered, numerous hearings were held, and it was passed unanimously out of my committee.

FEDERAL IT ACQUISITION REFORM ACT (FITARA) AMENDMENT TO NDAA

My amendment is a modified version of a bill reported from my committee unanimously in March. It reforms—Government-wide—the process by which federal information technology is acquired.

It is particularly fitting that this reform be included in the defense authorization bill. First, because majority of the Government's annual $80 billion in federal IT purchases is defense-related. Second, because this reform is a major update to a federal IT law originally enacted as part of a defense authorization bill—the Fiscal Year 1996 National Defense Authorization Act.

The 1996 NDAA included the Information Technology Management Reform Act—popularly known as Clinger-Cohen Act. It changed the way the federal government managed its IT resources—for instance by creating agency Chief Information Officers to oversee IT management.

Upon the introduction of this historic legislation, Chairman Clinger said,

''From the time the Second Continental Congress established a Commissary General in 1775, the procurement system has commanded the attention of both public officials and the American taxpayer. Unfortunately and all too often, the attention has focused on individual abuses rather than the overall system. Over the years, in response to these horror stories, Congress passed many laws—long and short, significant and trivial, new and old which standing alone were not overly harmful, but when added together created an increasingly overburdened mass of statutory requirements.

In December 1994, a report prepared for the Secretary of Defense found that, on average, the Government pays an additional 18 percent on what it buys solely because of the requirements it imposes on its contractors. This confirmed the average estimate by major contractors surveyed by GAO that the additional costs incurred in selling to the Government are about 19 percent. While some of the Government's unique requirements certainly are needed, we clearly are paying an enormous premium for them—billions of dollars annually.

And this is only part of the Government's inflated cost of doing business—for it includes only what is paid to contractors, not the cost of the Government's own administrative system. The Government's contracting officials are confronted with numerous mandates of their own, often amounting to step-by-step prescriptions that increase staff and equipment needs, and leave little room for the exercise of business judgment, initiative, and creativity.''

Many of his sentiments are still applicable today. Since the mid-Nineties, technology has leaped forward, and the federal government's spending on IT procurement has tripled. So my amendment—the Information Technology Acquisition Reform Act—updates Clinger-Cohen, with an emphasis on reforming the way the federal government purchases IT products and services.

GAO has identified duplicative IT investment as a problem in its annual reports to Congress on duplication. IT acquisition program failure rates and cost overruns are between 72 and 80%. Some estimate as much as $20 billion is wasted annually in this area.

We need to enhance the best value to the taxpayer by aligning the cumbersome federal acquisition process to major trends in the IT industry.

This amendment accomplishes this by empowering agency CIO's with budget authority over IT programs. It establishes centers of excellence in specific areas of IT procurement to develop expertise and leverage the Government's economy of scale in purchasing commonly-used IT products and services, so that agencies buy cheaper, faster and smarter. It accelerates consolidation and optimization of the Federal Government's proliferating data centers. And it ensures procurement decisions give due consideration to all technologies—including open source—and that contracts are awarded based on best long-term value proposition.

A discussion draft of the FITARA bill was posted last September. I held two full committee hearings on the bill, and the language has evolved through the course of several rewrites and extensive feedback from contracting and technology experts from inside and outside Government.

This is a significant and timely reform that will enhance both defense and non-defense procurement. I urge all members to support this amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy, and I appreciate the leadership for including this amendment in the en bloc amendment.

It is important that we deal with improving the quality of life for our servicemembers and their families.

In a situation all too familiar for our military families, every few years they find themselves living in a new military base with their children having to start a new school and having to adapt to a new environment. Making this transition even more difficult, their loved ones could be serving in Iraq or Afghanistan in constant danger.

This is an effort to make sure that we help our military installations include things that enhance the livability of that environment, to help with green space, public gardens, sidewalks, bike and running trails, things that are recognized in urban development as important amenities that add value and quality of life, while also helping the Department of Defense adapt best practices to build military bases to promote close-knit communities that work for families, which is critical.

I appreciate the progress that's been made and the committee working with us to make sure that this is enhanced as we move forward.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chair, at this time I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chair, I rise today to engage my friend, Chairman MCKEON, in a colloquy regarding the Defense Contract Audit Agency, or DCAA, and express concerns about the potential overreach of its authority.

The DCAA plays a critical role in our contracting system. As such, in recent years, Congress has provided substantial human and financial resources to address its well-documented workload backlog and other challenges. I am in favor of such resources and encourage DCAA to focus on eliminating the backlog. However, it appears that DCAA may be broadly accessing a myriad of contractor documents that have little or no impact on determining the effectiveness of contractor business systems.

The FY13 National Defense Authorization Act contained a provision, section 832, which set parameters for DCAA's access to the internal audits of companies that provide goods and services to the Department of Defense. Specifically, it is my understanding the committee was focused on contractors' business systems and ensuring robust and independent internal audit controls to those systems. However, it appears DCAA is broadly interpreting section 832 as providing DCAA with the authority to access all contractor internal audits and supporting documents. This is concerning on many levels.

I would ask the chairman if he has considered the potentially chilling effect on a company's desire to maintain a robust internal audit program if the government is demanding unfettered access to information they may not need or may potentially misuse. This is especially worrisome when this overreach extends to the very proprietary data that makes these companies competitive in the marketplace.

I thank the chairman for his leadership and ask if he shares my concerns regarding the potential overreach of DCAA in this area.

Mr. MCKEON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KINGSTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCKEON. I thank my friend for bringing up this important issue.

As you are aware, we did not reopen the issue in the current bill. However, I share your concerns and would hope that DCAA is not overreaching on its authority. The potential for DCAA to misuse corporate internal audits or to go fishing through these audits without understanding their context or purpose is very concerning. The committee is continuing to monitor their implementation of access to company internal audits and is willing to take additional action if we determine DCAA is acting beyond the limited grant of authority that Congress provided.

Again, thank you for raising this important issue.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SWALWELL).

Mr. SWALWELL of California. I thank the gentleman from Washington.

First, I also want to thank my friend, Congressman PAT MEEHAN, for cosponsoring my amendment.

Due to sequestration, the Department of Defense has not been allowing military bands to perform at community events, even when the sponsoring community organization pays for all associated expenses, because the Department of Defense is saying that the reimbursement is never credited to the proper account.

Well, this is hard to believe. First, because it's been going on before, where community events have reimbursed the Department of Defense and there have not been any problems that we've been aware of. But since sequestration, they're now saying it cannot be done. Well, this is a civilian force of over 700,000 people. I'm sure that we can find a way to make this work and support our community events.

My amendment is simple. It will allow military bands to perform at community events when the hosting organization fully funds the band's expenditures by ensuring that the money from the hosting organization is returned to the relevant department's accounts.

This issue came to my attention when a Marine Corps veteran from my district in Pleasanton, California, Brooks Wilson, informed me that at this year's 148th Scottish Gathering and Games in Pleasanton, the Marine Corps band wouldn't be able to perform, even though his organization would fully fund the band's expenditure just as they have always done previously.

Public performances by military bands like the Marine Corps band bring a sense of patriotism and community to our cities and towns. They also help enliven events like the Scottish Games, increasing attendance and helping boost and lift economic activity.

I ask my colleagues to join Congressman MEEHAN and I in supporting our military bands and our amendment.

Mr. MCKEON. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Chair, I want to thank the ranking member and the chair for making my amendment an en bloc amendment.

This amendment deals with the 50-plus billion dollars that we have spent on the Afghan National Security Forces. An additional $7.7 billion is to be added this year. That is a 50 percent increase over last year.

The $2.6 billion addition is for equipment with absolutely no justification, no idea what the equipment is—airplanes, related. There is no knowledge of whether the Afghan National Security Force can use it or not. The amendment simply says that money will not be available until and unless there is clarity as to where the money is going to be spent, how it's going to be spent, how the equipment will be purchased. We don't want to write a $2.6 billion blank check for additional graft and corruption in Afghanistan.

This amendment will be in the en bloc amendment, and I thank the committee for making it possible.

Mr. MCKEON. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1050

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank my colleague, and I thank the distinguished chairman of the committee as well.

I want to talk about the FITARA bill, the Federal Information Technology Acquisition Reform Act, that I am a coauthor of with the distinguished chairman of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, Mr. ISSA. This is the most sweeping reform legislation since Clinger-Cohen.

Today, Federal IT acquisition is a cumbersome, bureaucratic, and wasteful exercise. In recent decades, taxpayers have been forced to foot the bill for massive IT failures that ring up staggeringly high costs and exhibit astonishingly poor performance. Program failures and cost overruns plague the vast majority of major Federal IT investments, while Federal managers report that 47 percent of the budget is spent on maintaining antiquated and inadequate IT platforms even today. The annual pricetag of this wasteful spending is estimated at $20 billion a year.

The Air Force, for example, invested 6 years in a modernization effort that cost more than $1 billion but failed to deliver a usable product, promptly its Assistant Secretary to state:

I'm personally appalled at the limited capabilities that program has produced relative to that amount of investment.

Mission-critical IT investment failures not only waste taxpayer dollars, but they jeopardize our Nation's safety.

Our bill would modernize, streamline, and make more transparent by actually posting 80 percent of all acquisitions on the Web site. It would streamline the decisionmaking process. Right now, the 26 major Federal agencies, Madam Chairwoman, have over 250 people called CIO, chief information officers. We would designate one per agency who is responsible primarily and accountable primarily for IT acquisitions.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation. I again thank the distinguished chairman and the distinguished ranking member of the Armed Services Committee and their very

able staff for cooperating with Chairman ISSA and myself on this very important reform legislation, and I certainly hope when we get to conference with the Senate it will persevere.

Madam Chair, today, Federal IT acquisition is a cumbersome, bureaucratic, and wasteful exercise. In recent decades, taxpayers have been forced to foot the bill for massive IT program failures that ring up staggeringly high costs, but exhibit astonishingly poor performance. Program failure and cost overruns still plague the vast majority of major Federal IT investments, while Federal managers' report that 47 percent of their budget is spent on maintaining antiquated and inadequate IT platforms. The annual price tag of this wasteful spending on Federal IT programs is estimated to add up to approximately $20 billion.

The Air Force invested six years in a modernization effort that cost more than $1 billion, but failed to deliver a usable product, prompting its Assistant Secretary to state, ''I am personally appalled at the limited capabilities that program has produced relative to that amount of investment.''

Mission-critical IT investment failures not only waste taxpayer dollars, but they jeopardize our Nation's safety, security, and economy. From malfunctioning Census handheld computers that threatened to undermine a critical constitutional responsibility, to a promised electronic border fence that never materialized, time and time again, agency missions have been sabotaged by failed IT acquisitions.

This status quo is unacceptable and unsustainable.

I want to thank Chairman ISSA for working with me in a productive and bipartisan manner to develop Amendment 117, a modified version of H.R. 1232, the Federal Information Technology Acquisition Reform Act, which was favorably reported by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform with unanimous support in March 2013.

Our comprehensive proposal seeks to streamline and strengthen the Federal IT acquisition process and promote the adoption of best practices from the technology community. We have solicited extensive input from all stakeholders to refine and improve our amendment in an open and transparent manner.

The resulting bipartisan amendment would elevate and empower agency CIOs with authority over, and accountability for, effectively managing the IT portfolio. It would also enhance OMB's role, tasking it with leading enterprise-wide portfolio management, and coordinating shared services and shared platforms across government.

This bipartisan amendment would also empower agencies to eliminate duplicative and wasteful IT contracts that have proliferated for commonly-used, IT Commodity-like investments, such as e-mail. In this era of austerity, agencies cannot afford to spend precious dollars and time creating duplicative, wasteful contracts for products and licenses they already own.

In addition to improving how the government procures IT, this amendment would also enhance how the government deploys these tools. It would accelerate data center optimization to achieve greater operating efficiency and cost-savings, as recommended by the U.S. Government Accountability Office; provide agencies with flexibility to leverage efficient cloud services; and strengthen the accountability and transparency of Federal IT programs. If enacted, 80 percent of the approximately $80 billion annual Federal IT investment would be required to be posted on the public IT Dashboard, compared to the 50 percent coverage that exists today.

Consistent with the principle that public contracts are public documents, our amendment also strengthens transparency in regard to the final negotiated price a company charges a Federal agency for a good or service. Today, far too many agencies negotiate blanket purchase agreements in silos, without any knowledge that another agency has already negotiated a BPA with the same exact vendor, for the same exact product, but at a different price.

Nearly two decades after the Information Technology Management Reform Act and the Federal Acquisition Reform Act were enacted as Division E and Division D of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996—reforms that are better known today as the foundational ''Clinger-Cohen Act''—a bipartisan consensus is finally forming around the urgent need to further streamline and strengthen how the Federal Government acquires and deploys IT.

The bipartisan Issa-Connolly Amendment 117 will enhance the statutory framework established by Clinger-Cohen to create an efficient and effective Federal IT procurement system that best serves agencies, industry, and most importantly, the American taxpayer. I urge all my colleagues to join me in supporting this important bipartisan reform measure.

Mr. MCKEON. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. We have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCKEON. How much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California has 5¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. MCKEON. Thank you very much, Madam Chair. I'm going to use that time to make up for the time that I lost earlier.

What I would like to do is read the letter from the National Guard Association of the United States. This is a letter to Chairman MCKEON and Ranking Member SMITH, and he says:

As you are aware, there is an amendment sponsored by Reps. Van Hollen, Moran, Mulvaney, and Woodall that would strip $5 billion out of the Overseas Contingency Operation funding and the underlying readiness and modernization plus-ups supported in the bill, which includes $400 million for the National Guard and Reserve Equipment Account (NGREA). This would have a significant impact on National Guard equipment, as this funding is critical for new equipment purchases not planned for or funded by the active components in the President's budget. We urge you to oppose amendment 39.

Then he goes into some details about what that would mean.

Finally he ends with:

For these reasons, we urge you to oppose amendment 39 to remove the $5 billion in OCO funds, where National Guard's NGREA funds are included. Thank you for your attention to this critical matter.

It is signed Gus Hargett, Major General, U.S. Army, Retired, National Guard Association.

I think it is very important that we understand fully what we're talking about in these funds. Congressman VAN HOLLEN referred to General Dempsey saying this was all the money we needed. Let me just read to you from the transcript that he was talking to General Dempsey about in their hearing:

Congressman Van Hollen: General Dempsey, does the OCO request that was made, in your judgment, satisfy our military requirement for OCO?

General Dempsey: Yeah, it does. But this year's request proved inadequate to the task. We have to have some understanding of trying to predict the future 2 years out.

Let me just go back a couple years. They asked for a certain amount of money in last year's budget, but they actually spent $10 billion over that. So they're over-budget coming into this year, and we know, based on past experience, that they're going to spend more than that. And then to try to have an amendment to take $5 billion out of that when we're trying to compensate for the shortfall they had from last year, and then going into this year, is just irresponsible.

When I was in Afghanistan a couple of months ago, I was meeting with a commander there, General Dunford, and he said the thing that people need to understand, as we're winding down this war effort in Afghanistan, and we have to have the troops out of there by the end of 2014, it's going to cost us more because we're closing down the bigger bases, and we have to accomplish that this year.

So we've got the commander saying it's going to cost us more, and we have an amendment saying we should cut $5 billion out. I think it's important that we really put this all in context and understand how those troops who are out there today, fighting, going outside the wire and having attacks on their compounds, are going to be short $5 billion if this amendment is passed.

There exists a nearly $7 billion shortfall in funding to meet just the current readiness requirements. The Army alone needs an additional $3.2 billion beyond what's requested in the President's budget. This is testimony from the chiefs of these different services. The Marine Corps needs another $321.6 million. The Navy is funded $1.62 billion below required levels, and the Air Force $1.3 billion short of needed funding.

So I needed that time, Madam Chair, those 15 seconds that I thought I lost earlier.

But I think it's very important that people understand, this will be one of the most important votes coming up in this next series. We cannot afford to cut money out for warfighters who are over there putting their life on the line for us today.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GARDNER. Madam Chair, today I rise in support of my amendment to

H.R. 1960, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014. This amendment gives the land owners and ranchers in the Piñon Canyon community of Southeast Colorado peace of mind and economic certainty by requiring Congressional approval in order for the Department of Defense to expand Piñon Canyon Maneuver Site (PCMS) near Fort Carson, Colorado. It also requires specific appropriation approval for PCMS expansion.

The passage of this amendment would represent a major step forward in providing assurance for the people of Southeast Colorado, who for the last several years have been subjected to a constant state of uncertainty over possible PCMS expansion into their lands. Despite an annual funding ban placed on the Department of the Army that effectively prohibits the expansion of the boundaries of PCMS, my constituents wonder every year whether the rules will change and the rug will be swept from under their feet. Today I ask my colleagues to come together to create a permanent fix. With the passage of this amendment, there would be stringent guidelines that restrict the expansion of PCMS, fully codifying that Congress must vote on PCMS land acquisition, that the appropriation must be authorized, and that the appropriation must be made.

Make no mistake, the soldiers at Fort Carson exemplify the finest and bravest our nation has to offer. By removing the uncertainty surrounding expansion plans for the PCMS, we believe relations with surrounding communities will stabilize and greatly improve. Our armed forces are focused on defending freedom, and the specter of PCMS expansion has served only as a distraction to those on base and those in neighboring communities.

Few other places in the U.S. have this level of statutory protection. In fact, a Congressional authorization for a specific land acquisition is unique to this amendment. I am pleased to help provide assurance to the farmers, ranchers, and families of Southeast Colorado that there will be no expansion of Piñon Canyon without the deliberation and explicit approval of Congress.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Chair, included in this en bloc amendment is amendment #163 to H.R. 1960, made in order by H. Res. 260. This amendment is bipartisan and submitted by myself, Mr. FLEISCHMANN of Tennessee and Mr. LUJÁN of New Mexico. It will protect and provide public access to Manhattan Project facilities at three Department of Energy former defense sites through the establishment of an historical park. This is essentially the text of H.R. 1208, reported favorably by the Committee on Natural Resources by unanimous consent in May 2013.

These three locations that the park will encompass were integral to the tremendous engineering and human achievements of the Manhattan Project launched during World War II. The three locations are the Hanford site in my home State of Washington, Los Alamos in New Mexico, and Oak Ridge in Tennessee.

The vast majority of the facilities that are eligible to be included in this park are already owned by the federal government, and they are located on former defense lands owned and controlled by the Department of Energy.

As our nation already possesses these pieces of history, the real purpose of this amendment is to officially declare the importance of preserving the history, providing access to the public, and include the unique abilities of the National Park Service to help tell this story.

Currently, some of these facilities slated for inclusion in this park are scheduled to be destroyed at considerable taxpayer expense. A great many local community leaders in all three states and interested citizens have worked to coordinate a commitment to preserving this piece of our history. Additionally, the government will save tens of millions of dollars from foregone destruction, as opposed to the minimal cost of providing public access and park administration.

Under this amendment, not only will history be protected, but so will taxpayer dollars.

Let me describe one example of the savings. The B Reactor at the Hanford site in Washington state is the first full-scale nuclear reactor ever constructed. Walking into its control room and viewing the reactor itself are like walking back in time. The federal government has a legal obligation to clean up the B Reactor that involves partial demolition, then cocooning the building in concrete for 75 years with continual monitoring, before final removal and demolition at a total cost in today's dollars of $90–100 million. With the amendment, this $100 million will not be spent and this piece of history will not be demolished.

This matter has been carefully studied by both the Department of the Interior and the Department of Energy. Both Departments and the National Park Service support this action. On behalf of the Obama Administration, Interior Secretary Salazar has repeatedly expressed support for the park, as have Department of Energy officials of both the Obama and Bush Administrations.

In recognition of the important contributions to the Manhattan Project by the men and women at sites across the country, the amendment contains a provision allowing communities like Dayton, Ohio, for example, outside the historical park, to receive technical assistance and support from the Department of the Interior as they seek to preserve and manage their own Manhattan Project park resources.

Many, many individuals and organizations have dedicated countless hours towards this effort to preserve and tell this piece of history, and to ensure current and future generations not only will learn this story, but be able to visit and see it themselves. Among those endorsing this effort are the Atomic Heritage Foundation, the National Parks Conservation Association, the National Trust for Historic Preservation, the Energy Communities Alliance, the City of Richland Washington, the City of Oak Ridge Tennessee, the Tri-City Development Council, and many more in Los Alamos and other areas across the nation. Additionally, this effort has received strong endorsements from newspapers from one side of our nation to the other, including the Washington Post, the Boston Globe, and the Los Angeles Times.

This is a good amendment that preserves and shares our nation's history.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Chair, I rise to discuss of my amendment, number 146, to H.R. 1960, the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014." My amendment simply states that nothing in the bill should be construed as an authorization for the use of military force against Iran. I would like to thank the cosponsors of my amendment: Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. ELLISON of Minnesota, and Ms. LEE of California. I would also like to thank Chairman MCKEON and Ranking Member SMITH for accepting this amendment in en bloc amendment number eight. By adopting this amendment, the House of Representatives is making it clear, for the second straight year, that none of the provisions in this bill should be interpreted as a war authorization against Iran.

In recent months, the possibility of a preemptive military strike against Iran has been openly discussed as a policy option of last resort as our country and our allies determine how to best confront the challenge posed by Iran's nuclear program.

At the same time, this national discussion has prompted a large number of current and former military and intelligence officials to come forward to encourage the Congress and the Administration to consider the possible consequences, both intended and unintended, of such a strike.

These include high-level former U.S. and Israeli national security officials, including a Bush administration National Intelligence Council chairman, a former national intelligence officer for the Near East and South Asia, Colin Powell's chief of staff, five retired generals, the former Director of the Israeli Mossad, and a former Chief of Staff of the Israeli Defense Forces.

These experts have raised concerns that an attack on Iran could possibly result in serious harm to the world economy, potentially ignite a regional war, and even push Iran into building a nuclear weapon.

With consequences as serious as these being raised by outside and former national security experts, it is critical that any decision to initiate military action against Iran be rigorously debated and, if necessary, be backed by a separate war authorization.

Again, I thank my colleagues for supporting my amendment.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Chair, I rise to strongly oppose Amendment #171 to H.R. 1960, the National Defense Authorization Act

for Fiscal Year 2014. This amendment is part of what for many of our Republican colleagues is an obsession with singling out the District of Columbia for anti-democratic bullying. There is no federal law that exempts active duty military personnel in their personal capacities from otherwise applicable federal firearms laws, except for residency requirements, or from any state or local firearms laws. Yet this amendment expresses the sense of Congress that active duty military personnel should be exempt from the gun laws of only one local jurisdiction, the District of Columbia. If the sponsor of this amendment believes that active duty military personnel should be exempt from federal, state or local firearms laws, why did he not offer an amendment that would apply nationwide instead of only to the District of Columbia? Republicans, who profess to support a limited federal government and local control of local matters, pick on the District of Columbia because they think they can. They are wrong.

The sponsor of this amendment lives in the past, acting as if the changes D.C. made to its gun laws after the Supreme Court's Heller decision in 2008 had never happened and as if a federal district court and a federal appeals court have not upheld the constitutionality of those revised gun laws. The sponsor also acts as if the Supreme Court's McDonald decision in 2010 had not happened. In McDonald, the court said that the Second Amendment does not confer the ''right to keep and carry any weapon whatsoever in any manner whatsoever and for whatever purpose.''

This amendment is the second time this year the sponsor has tried to interfere in the local affairs of the District of Columbia. Earlier this year, the sponsor introduced this amendment as a stand-alone bill. Although this amendment is non-binding, we will fight every attack on our rights as a local government, just as any member here would. This amendment does nothing less than attempt to pave the way for actual inroads into the District of Columbia's gun safety laws. The majority can expect a fierce fight from us whenever they treat the American citizens who live in the District of Columbia as second-class citizens. The House adopted this amendment last year, but, working with our allies, led by Senate Armed Services Committee Chairman CARL LEVIN and House Armed Services Committee Ranking Member ADAM SMITH, we were able to keep it out of the final bill, and we will fight to do so again this year.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Madam Chair, I am pleased to cosponsor this bipartisan amendment, which would prohibit the Defense Department from circumventing Congressional intent with regard to Russian state arms dealer Rosoboronexport. This amendment prohibits the Department of Defense from purchasing military helicopters from Rosoboronexport—a company that has been supplying weapons to Syrian President Bashar al-Assad's regime in its ''campaign of terror against its own people,'' as characterized by Secretary of State Kerry.

The civil unrest and violence that has engulfed Syria and fueled instability across the region just entered its third year. This week, the United Nations reported that 93,000 people have been killed in this conflict. In addition, more than 1.6 million Syrian refugees are now displaced across five countries, and it is estimated that half of the population of Syria will be in need of aid by the end of this year.

Russia has been the Assad regime's main arms supplier, recently announcing that it would provide Syria with advanced S–300 missile defense batteries. The Syrian Army also requested 20,000 Kalashnikov assault rifles, 20 million rounds of ammunition, machine guns, grenade launchers, grenades, and sniper rifles with night-vision sights from Rosoboronexport.

The bipartisan amendment before us today, which I am pleased to cosponsor with Representatives DELAURO, GRANGER, MORAN, KINGSTON, ELLISON, and WOLF, would simply clarify the restrictions outlined in last year's defense authorization bill, which prohibited the Pentagon from using FY13 funds to enter into any contract with the Russian state arms dealer. Unfortunately, the Defense Department ignored that Congressional direction and found a way to maneuver around the law. Defense officials announced in April that they would use FY12 Afghanistan Security Forces Funds to purchase 30 more Mi–17 helicopters from Rosoboronexport. The signing of this contract is imminent.

Our amendment would ensure that no funding is used to purchase equipment from this Russian arms dealer unless it cooperates with a pending Defense Contract Audit Agency review of another contract in which Rosoboronexport is suspected of overcharging the U.S. Navy. Moreover, the amendment would also ensure that future helicopter purchases for the Afghan National Security Force will be competitively bid.

I urge my colleagues to support our bipartisan amendment, which will hold this Russian arms dealer accountable for its reprehensible role in the Syrian conflict, as well as ensure that the Pentagon complies with Congressional intent.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON).

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 123 OFFERED BY MR. BLUMENAUER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 123 printed in part B of House Report 113–108.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 496, insert after line 24 the following (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 1218. IMPROVEMENT OF THE IRAQI SPECIAL IMMIGRANT VISA PROGRAM.

The Refugee Crisis in Iraq Act of 2007 (8 U.S.C. 1157 note) is amended—

(1) in section 1242, by amending subsection (c) to read as follows:

''(c) IMPROVED APPLICATION PROCESS.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014,'';

(2) in section 1244, as amended by this Act, is further amended—

(A) by amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (c), the Secretary of Homeland Security, or, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of State in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security, may provide an alien described in subsection (b) with the status of a special immigrant under section 101(a)(27) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 (a)(27)), and shall, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, ensure efficiency by which applications for special immigrant visas under section 1244(a) are processed so that all steps incidental to the issuance of such visas, including required screenings and background checks, are completed not later than 9 months after the date on which an eligible alien applies for such visa, if the alien—'';

(B) in subsection (b)—

(i) in paragraph (4) by adding at the end the following:

''(A) REVIEW PROCESS FOR DENIAL BY CHIEF OF MISSION.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—An applicant who has been denied Chief of Mission approval required by subparagraph (A) shall—

''(I) receive a written decision; and

''(II) be provided 120 days from the date of the decision to request reopening of the decision to provide additional information, clarify existing information, or explain any unfavorable information.

''(ii) SENIOR COORDINATOR.—The Secretary of State shall designate, in the Embassy of the United States in Baghdad, Iraq, a senior coordinator responsible for overseeing the efficiency and integrity of the processing of special immigrant visas under this section, who shall be given—

''(I) sufficiently high security clearance to review Chief of Mission denials in cases that appear to have relied upon insufficient or incorrect information; and

''(II) responsibility for ensuring that an applicant described in clause (i) receives the information described in clause (i)(I).'';

(3) in section 1248, by adding at the end the following:

''(f) REPORT ON IMPROVEMENTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, shall submit a report, with a classified annex, if necessary, to—

''(A) the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate;

''(B) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

''(C) the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives; and

''(D) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

''(2) CONTENTS.—The report submitted under paragraph (1) shall describe the implementation of improvements to the processing of applications for special immigrant visas under section 1244(a), including information relating to—

''(A) enhancing existing systems for conducting background and security checks of persons applying for special immigrant status, which shall—

''(i) support immigration security; and

''(ii) provide for the orderly processing of such applications without delay;

''(B) the financial, security, and personnel considerations and resources necessary to carry out this subtitle;

''(C) the number of aliens who have applied for special immigrant visas under section 1244 during each month of the preceding fiscal year;

''(D) the reasons for the failure to expeditiously process any applications that have been pending for longer than 9 months;

''(E) the total number of applications that are pending due to the failure—

''(i) to receive approval from the Chief of Mission;

''(ii) for U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services to complete the adjudication of the Form I-360;

''(iii) to conduct a visa interview; or

''(iv) to issue the visa to an eligible alien;

''(F) the average wait times for an applicant at each of the stages described in subparagraph (E);

''(G) the number of denials or rejections at each of the stages described in subparagraph (E); and

''(H) a breakdown of reasons for denials at by the Chief of Mission based on the categories already made available to denied special immigrant visa applicants in the denial letter sent to them by the Chief of Mission.

''(g) PUBLIC QUARTERLY REPORTS.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, and every 3 months thereafter, the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, shall publish a report on the website of the Department of State that describes the efficiency improvements made in the process by which applications for special immigrant visas under section 1244(a) are processed, including information described in subparagraphs (C) through (H) of subsection (f)(2).''.

SEC. 1219. IMPROVEMENT OF THE AFGHAN SPECIAL IMMIGRANT VISA PROGRAM.

Section 602(b) of the Afghan Allies Protection Act of 2009 (8 U.S.C. 1101 note) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (D)—

(i) by adding at the end the following:

''(ii) REVIEW PROCESS FOR DENIAL BY CHIEF OF MISSION.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—An applicant who has been denied Chief of Mission approval shall—

''(aa) receive a written decision; and

''(bb) be provided 120 days from the date of receipt of such opinion to request reconsideration of the decision to provide additional information, clarify existing information, or explain any unfavorable information.

''(II) SENIOR COORDINATOR.—The Secretary of State shall designate, in the Embassy of the United States in Kabul, Afghanistan, a senior coordinator responsible for overseeing the efficiency and integrity of the processing of special immigrant visas under this section, who shall be given—

''(aa) sufficiently high security clearance to review Chief of Mission denials in cases that appear to have relied upon insufficient or incorrect information; and

''(bb) responsibility for ensuring that an applicant described in subclause (I) receives the information described in subclause (I)(aa).'';

(2) in paragraph (4)—

(A) in the heading, by striking ''PROHIBITION ON FEES'' and inserting ''APPLICATION PROCESS'';

(B) by striking ''The Secretary'' and inserting the following:

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, shall improve the efficiency by which applications for special immigrant visas under paragraph (1) are processed so that all steps incidental to the issuance of such visas, including required screenings and background checks, are completed not later than 6 months after the date on which an eligible alien applies for such visa.

''(B) PROHIBITION ON FEES.—The Secretary''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(12) REPORT ON IMPROVEMENTS.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report, with a classified annex, if necessary, that describes the implementation of improvements to the processing of applications for special immigrant visas under this subsection, including information relating to—

''(A) enhancing existing systems for conducting background and security checks of persons applying for special immigrant status, which shall—

''(i) support immigration security; and

''(ii) provide for the orderly processing of such applications without delay;

''(B) the financial, security, and personnel considerations and resources necessary to carry out this section;

''(C) the number of aliens who have applied for special immigrant visas under this subsection during each month of the preceding fiscal year;

''(D) the reasons for the failure to expeditiously process any applications that have been pending for longer than 9 months;

''(E) the total number of applications that are pending due to the failure—

''(i) to receive approval from the Chief of Mission;

''(ii) for U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services to complete the adjudication of the Form I-360;

''(iii) to conduct a visa interview; or

''(iv) to issue the visa to an eligible alien;

''(F) the average wait times for an applicant at each of the stages described in subparagraph (E);

''(G) the number of denials or rejections at each of the stages described in subparagraph (E); and

''(H) a breakdown of reasons for denials by the Chief of Mission based on the categories already made available to denied special immigrant visa applicants in the denial letter sent to them by the Chief of Mission.

''(13) PUBLIC QUARTERLY REPORTS.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, and every 3 months thereafter, the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, shall publish a report on the website of the Department of State that describes the efficiency improvements made in the process by which applications for special immigrant visas under this subsection are processed, including information described in subparagraph (C) through (H) of paragraph (12).''.

SEC. 1219. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

(b) PURPOSE.—Expressing the Sense of the House or Representatives that the Special Immigration Visa programs authorized in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 and the Afghan Allies Protection Act of 2009 are critical to the U.S. national security, and that these programs must be reformed and extended in order to meet the Congressional intent with which they were created.

(b) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Congress created the Special Immigration Visa program for the purposes of protecting and aiding the many brave Iraqis and Afghans whose lives, and the lives of their families, were endangered as a result of their faithful and valuable service to the United States during Operations Enduring Freedom and Iraqi Freedom.

(2) The Iraq Special Immigrant Visa program is set to expire at the end of fiscal year 2013.

(3) The Afghanistan Special Immigrant Visa program is set to expire at the end of fiscal year 2014.

(4) Despite the pending expiration of the Special Immigrant Visa programs, many brave Iraqis, Afghans, and their families, continue to face ongoing and serious threats as a result of their employment by or on behalf of the U.S. Government.

(5) Between FY08-FY12, only 22 percent of the available Iraqi SIVs (5,500 visas out of 25,000 visas) have been issued and 12 percent of the available Afghan SIVs (1,051 visas out of 8,500 visas) have been issued.

(6) As the Washington Post reported in October 2012, over 5,000 documentarily complete Afghan SIV applications remained in a backlog.

(7) The implementation of the Special Immigration Visa programs has been protracted and inefficient.

(8) The application and approval process for the Special Immigration Visa program is unnecessarily opaque and difficult to navigate.

(9) Applicants in both Iraq and Afghanistan often have effusive recommendations from numerous military personnel, have served the U.S. war efforts for many years, and have served valiantly, in some instances literally taking a bullet for a U.S. service member, and yet are denied approval for a Special Immigration Visa with little to no transparency.

(10) Overly narrow provisions contained in the Afghan Allies Protection Act of 2009 leave many deserving Afghans and their families in need of U.S. assistance, but unable to access the Special Immigration Visa program.

(11) The United States has a responsibility to follow through on its promise to protect those Iraqis and Afghans who have risked their lives to aid our troops and protect America's security.

(12) The extension and reform of the Iraq and Afghanistan Special Immigrant Visa programs is a matter of national security.

(13) The extension and reform of the Afghan Special Immigrant Visa program is essential to the U.S. mission in Afghanistan.

(c) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House of Representatives that the Iraq and Afghanistan Special Immigrant Visa programs should be—

(1) reformed by—

(A) ensuring applications are processed in a timely, and transparent fashion;

(B) providing parity between the two Special Immigrant Visa programs so that Afghan principal applicants, like Iraqi principal applicants, are able to include their spouse, children, siblings, and parents; and

(C) expanding eligibility for the Special Immigrant Visa programs to Afghan or Iraqi men and women employed by, or on behalf of, a media or nongovernmental organization headquartered in the United States, or an organization or entity closely associated with the United States mission in Iraq or Afghanistan that has received U.S. Government funding through an official and documented contract, award, grant, or cooperative agreement; and

(2) extended in—

(A) Iraq through the year 2018, without authorizing any additional Special Immigrant Visas as authorized in the original statue; and

(B) Afghanistan through the year 2018, without authorizing any additional Special Immigrant Visas as authorized in the original statue.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) and a

Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Chair, I yield myself 2½ minutes.

Madam Chair, we spend appropriate time on the floor commemorating the bravery of our men and women who were in harm's way in Iraq and Afghanistan, but there were other brave men and women who worked with our soldiers, putting themselves in harm's way, and I'm referring to foreign nationals—Iraqis and Afghanistan citizens who were interpreters and who were drivers, people working for NGOs, people who made it possible for our troops to perform at the highest level. They served shoulder to shoulder with our men and women in uniform.

Now, I am pleased that there is a partial extension in the Special Immigrant Visa program in the underlying bill for Iraqis and Afghanis. It's important that we have these special visas. I have been pleased to have played a small role in helping create the Special Immigrant Visa program that enables these people to escape harm's way. Many of them are in danger of being killed because people know that they helped our forces, and they are left behind.

I really appreciate the ranking member, the chair, and their staff for the work to help partially extend the Special Immigration Visa program. But this bipartisan amendment, offered with my colleagues, Congresswoman GABBARD and Representatives KINZINGER and STIVERS, all three of whom served in the field of battle, is an opportunity to help ensure these programs finish the job for which they were created.

□ 1100

These programs expire for Iraq at the end of this fiscal year. That's September 30, and the following September 30 for Afghanistan. And while they are set to expire, those in Iraq and Afghanistan who made our mission possible continue to be plagued by inefficiencies and bureaucratic hurdles. Through fiscal year 2012, only 22 percent of the available Iraq SIVs have been issued, and only 12 percent for Afghanistan.

The Washington Post reported that over 5,000 documentarily complete Afghan applications remain in a backlog. The backlog and delay means not just weeks or months, but years for those who risked their lives to help the U.S. mission, and means living in constant fear and hiding, knowing they or their families could be killed at any moment.

Our amendment demonstrates a strong commitment from the House for comprehensive extension and reform in conference. It enhances the programs by providing efficiency, transparency, accuracy, and oversight.

Madam Chair, I yield the remaining time to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. GABBARD).

Ms. GABBARD. Madam Chair, I rise in strong support of this amendment to improve the Special Immigrant Visa programs for local civilians who put their lives in danger to aid our troops as they've served in Iraq and Afghanistan.

We see in times of war and in times of conflict that our servicemembers are lauded and honored for their service and tremendous sacrifice, but there are many stories that remain untold. There are many unseen heroes who sacrifice every single day as they serve alongside our troops.

During my first deployment to Iraq, I served in a medical unit, and we had two interpreters who worked with us on a daily basis. One was named Kaddam. He sat in our clinic, went out on missions with our medics. I spoke to him almost every day and learned so much about his family, his community, and the challenges that he overcame every day to just work with us.

He drove home every night with a firearm under his driver's seat, in fear, not only of his own life, but in fear of the health and safety of his family. He had a few young children, and he spoke very strongly about his hopes and his dreams for them being able to have a future, to have an education, which was a far cry from the life that he was living there; and that's why he served with us.

We had another interpreter who we called, our Hawaii unit called Kahuna. And his situation was very different. He lived in secrecy, where his neighbors and his friends didn't know that he was working with us; and because of that, he stayed in our camp. He lived with us and worked with us on a daily basis because he believed in what we were doing, and he wouldn't want to risk his family's life.

The stories go on and on of those who have sacrificed so much, not only because they believed in what we were doing, what our mission was, what our work was, but in the hopes that they could also live a free life for themselves, a life where they were not fraught on a daily basis with just getting by.

And for that, I personally stand in strong support of this.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chair, I rise to claim time in opposition to the amendment; however, I do not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCKEON. I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KINZINGER).

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate you yielding.

And, Mr. BLUMENAUER, thank you for leading on this, Ms. GABBARD and Mr. STIVERS as well. This is such an important issue.

You know, we're a Nation of commitments, and a lot of the times Washington gets this reputation of Republicans and Democrats don't agree on anything, and we just fight like cats and dogs. I feel like some of that is true, but I think this is a great example of where, frankly, people are coming together to say as a Nation what's the right thing to do here.

We've made commitments. We've taken ourselves and made promises to people, and people have put themselves out on the line for us. What's the right thing to do?

I would even dare to speculate that those of us that are sponsoring this amendment probably don't even agree on the future of the Iraq war or the Afghanistan war. But we do know that we believe we have to hold to this.

As Ms. GABBARD was talking about, there's a lot of unsung heroes in the war in Iraq and Afghanistan. I experienced it as well as a pilot in the military as people that were Iraqi nationals, in my case, that really stood up and put their lives on the line in order to fight for a new Iraq, to fight for a new freedom, to provide for their families, and to understand that they want to build an alliance between Iraq and the United States.

And a lot of them went home at night, as was eloquently expressed, went home at night in fear that this was going to cost them their lives, but knowing that the strength and the power of the United States was there with them, and that they could rest easy at night, knowing that we could keep to our words.

Unfortunately, many of these folks have been killed or targeted for killing, and do continue to live in fear. And so we created a program which would allow a lot of these that have put their lives on the line in order to facilitate what our interest is in Afghanistan and Iraq, to be able to come to the United States.

And, unfortunately, this has been bogged down in bureaucracy that doesn't make a lot of sense to me. It's been bogged down in the definition of whether they worked for the United States or whether they actually worked for ISAF. Well, I would tend to say that whether you worked for ISAF or the United States, you should probably fall under this program.

I think it's just right that we, as a Nation, figure out what's going wrong and do this, and I think this is a great opportunity. This is a great opportunity to come together and say, you know, you put your life on the line for us; we're going to do everything we can for you.

I think about all the times when I would be ready to go fly and, you know, you talk to folks that are associated with what we're doing; and had we not had interpreters there to be able to bring the languages, frankly, the United States and Iraq or Afghanistan together, we'd often just be staring at each other, not knowing what we're thinking, but we're each thinking something.

But to be able to have these folks that come together and really talk

about what it is that we need to do is the right thing to do.

I just, again, want to say that, as Americans, we have to hold to our commitments. This program provides lifesaving protection to those that served us. It will provide refuge to the countless Iraqis and Afghan civilians that have helped us, and it's the right thing to do.

So, again, I just want to say to Mr. BLUMENAUER, to Ms. GABBARD, to Mr. STIVERS and to everybody watching, frankly, and listening to these proceedings, thank you for your help.

Thank you to America for standing up and doing the right thing, and to those that continue to defend us day by day.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 137 OFFERED BY MS. DELAURO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 137 printed in part B of House Report 113–108.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title XII of division A, add the following new section:

SEC. 12__. LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS TO PURCHASE EQUIPMENT FROM ROSOBORONEXPORT.

(a) LIMITATION.—No funds authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense for any fiscal year after fiscal year 2013 may be used for the purchase of any equipment from Rosoboronexport until the Secretary of Defense certifies in writing to the congressional defense committees that, to the best of the Secretary's knowledge—

(1) Rosoboronexport is cooperating fully with the Defense Contract Audit Agency;

(2) Rosoboronexport has not delivered S–300 advanced anti-aircraft missiles to Syria; and

(3) no new contracts have been signed between the Bashar al Assad regime in Syria and Rosoboronexport since January 1, 2013.

(b) NATIONAL SECURITY WAIVER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense may waive the limitation in subsection (a) if the Secretary certifies that the waiver in order to purchase equipment from Rosoboronexport is in national security interest of the United States.

(2) REPORT.—If the Secretary waives the limitation in subsection (a) pursuant to paragraph (1), the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees, not later than 30 days before purchasing equipment from Rosoboronexport pursuant to the waiver, a report on the waiver. The report shall be submitted in classified or unclassified form, at the election of the Secretary. The report shall include the following:

(A) An explanation why it is in the national security interest of the United States to purchase equipment from Rosoboronexport.

(B) An explanation why comparable equipment cannot be purchased from another corporation.

(C) An assessment of the cooperation of Rosoboronexport with the Defense Contract Audit Agency.

(D) An assessment of whether and how many S–300 advanced anti-aircraft missiles have been delivered to the Assad regime by Rosoboronexport.

(E) A list of the contracts that Rosoboronexport has signed with the Assad regime since January 1, 2013.

(c) REQUIREMENT FOR COMPETITIVELY BID CONTRACTS.—The Secretary of Defense shall award any contract that will use United States funds for the procurement of helicopters for the Afghan Security Forces using competitive procedures based on requirements developed by the Secretary of Defense.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would strengthen a prohibition unanimously supported last year to stop the Defense Department from purchasing equipment from the Russian arms dealer Rosoboronexport.

As we have debated this bill, estimates of the death toll in Syria hit 93,000 and the administration confirmed use of chemical weapons by the Assad regime. Yet, remarkably, U.S. taxpayers continue to provide subsidies to Russia's arms dealer through no-bid Pentagon purchases of Mi-17 helicopters, even as the firm continues to serve as the top supplier of the weapons the Syrian regime is using to fuel the tragic war.

In fact, the Russian arms dealer recently took an order from the Syrian Army for a wide range of weaponry, and the possibility remains that Russia may provide Syria with S–300 air defense systems.

□ 1110

It is unacceptable that at the same time the Pentagon is purchasing Mi-17 helicopters for the Afghan National Security Forces from Rosoboronexport through no-bid contracts that do not allow U.S. companies to compete.

Last year, the Army purchased 31 Mi-17s from the Russian arms dealer. The President then signed into law last year's defense bill banning the Pentagon from using 2013 funds to enter into a contract with the Russian arms dealer. Yet, in a clear violation of the spirit of the law, DOD announced in April it would use 2012 Afghanistan Security Forces funds to purchase 30 more Mi-17s, a contract signing that is imminent. Meanwhile, the Defense Contract Audit Agency, or DCAA, attempted an audit of Rosoboronexport's pricing of Mi-17 helicopters, which the firm refused to cooperate with. This is outrageous.

My bipartisan amendment prohibits the Pentagon from purchasing equipment from the Russian arms maker unless the Secretary certifies the firm is cooperating with DCAA, not delivering S–300 missile defense batteries to Syria, and has not signed new contracts with Syria since the beginning of the year. The amendment also requires that any new contract for helicopters for the Afghans be competitively bid.

The Defense Department should not engage in contracts with companies arming the Syrian regime. This can and must stop. Furthermore, if we are going to spend U.S. taxpayers' dollars to provide helicopters to the Afghan National Security Forces, we should spend those dollars for the purchase of U.S.-made helicopters.

I urge support for my amendment and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the amendment although I will not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCKEON. I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time remains.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Connecticut has 2¼ minutes remaining.

Ms. DELAURO. I yield the balance of my time to my colleague from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), who has worked on this issue with me.

Mr. MORAN. I thank my very good friend from Connecticut—and the chairman of the committee because I trust that he will support this as well.

This amendment passed overwhelmingly last year, bipartisan vote. The problem is that the Defense Department ignored it. They went ahead, continuing to buy weapons from Rosoboronexport, the very same Russian arms supplier that is enabling President Assad to kill more than 90,000 of his own people, who is now, we confirmed, using chemical weapons against his people. 1.6 million Syrian refugees are scattered across five countries; and within the year, half of the Syrian population is going to be in need of aid. So this has to be fixed. This is not a sustainable situation.

The Obama administration says, well, we are going to have to get more aggressively involved, supplying more military assistance to the insurgents. But think about this: the problem is that Assad is getting all the weapons he wants. In fact, he's asked this Russian arms exporter, Rosoboronexport, for advanced S–300 missile defense batteries, 20,000 Kalashnikov assault rifles, 20 million rounds of ammunition, machine guns, grenade launchers, grenade sniper rifles with night vision sights. Mi-17 helicopters are also made by Rosoboronexport, and we're buying helicopters from them. Can't we coordinate the right hand with the left

hand? We should not be basically subsidizing Rosoboronexport, which is a large part of the problem in Syria.

Some have suggested that without Russia's aid, President Assad cannot continue killing his own people. Now, I don't know that we can ever convince President Putin to stop this—it's obviously a state-owned arms supplier—but surely the Congress can say, no, don't purchase from the same person that is supplying the Syrian regime.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part B of House Report 113–108 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 21 by Mr. TURNER of Ohio.

Amendment No. 22 by Mr. HOLT of New Jersey.

Amendment No. 25 by Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota.

Amendment No. 32 by Mr. NOLAN of Minnesota.

Amendment No. 33 by Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

Amendment No. 36 by Mr. GIBSON of New York.

Amendment No. 37 by Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado.

Amendment No. 19 by Mrs. WALORSKI of Indiana.

Amendment No. 20 by Mr. SMITH of Washington.

Amendment No. 14 by Mr. POLIS of Colorado.

Amendment No. 23 by Mr. POLIS of Colorado.

Amendment No. 39 by Mr. VAN HOLLEN of Maryland.

Amendment No. 123 by Mr. BLUMENAUER of Oregon.

Amendment No. 137 by Ms. DELAURO of Connecticut.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 21 OFFERED BY MR. TURNER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 239, noes 182, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 229]

AYES—239

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—182

Andrews
Barber
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—13

Bachmann
Campbell
Chu
Edwards
Fudge
Johnson (GA)
Markey
McCarthy (NY)
Neal
Pelosi
Poe (TX)
Shea-Porter
Westmoreland

□ 1142

Mr. FARR and Ms. BROWNLEY of California changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. BARTON, CRAWFORD, DUFFY, and LIPINSKI changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BARTON was allowed to speak out of order.)

52ND ANNUAL CONGRESSIONAL BASEBALL GAME

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Chairman, I have my 7-year-old son, Jack, with me this week.

As we walked on the floor, he asked me, ''Daddy, why is that trophy on that desk?''

And I said, ''Well, son, they won the game last night.''

So I rise in reluctant recognition of the fact that last night, at Nationals Park, the Democrats squeaked out a 22–0 victory over the stalwart Republican team.

Our MVP is Senator JEFF FLAKE from Arizona, who was a Member of this body until last year. We had a number of other Members who played very well—JOHN SHIMKUS, BILL JOHNSON, MIKE CONAWAY, RODNEY DAVIS, RON DESANTIS, and the list goes on and on. The fact remains that the Democrats won, and they are entitled to the trophy.

Our hats are off to you.

With that, I yield to my good friend, the manager from Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, Mr. MIKE DOYLE.

Mr. DOYLE. First off, I want to thank my good friend JOE BARTON—he is my good friend—for a good game last night.

I can't really single out individuals. This was a team effort on the Democratic side. Our team had 24 hits and no errors in the field. CEDRIC RICHMOND normally strikes out a lot of batters, and, last year, Cedric had 16 strikeouts. For the first five innings, Cedric didn't strike out a single batter. We had 15 putouts in the field. When you hit the ball, we fielded it, and we made the throws to first, and we made the plays.

It was the best team effort that I've seen out of the Democratic side in the 19 years I've been associated with the game, and I want to congratulate my team.

As my good friend JOE BARTON knows, the real winners of this game are three charities. We broke a record this year. We raised $300,000 for our charities—the Washington Boys & Girls Club, the Washington Literacy Council, and the Dream Foundation, which is going to help children in the Seventh Ward in Washington, D.C. This is going to be a great program for the kids—for boys and girls to learn baseball, but also to learn more important things in after-school learning centers and the like.

So, to the charities—the real winners of this game—congratulations.

This is a great tradition that helps bring us together. I can tell you that the members of the Republican baseball team are friends of ours, and we enjoy the camaraderie and the game every year, and we look forward to it again next year.

Mr. BARTON. I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MR. HOLT

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, 2-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 61, noes 362, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 230]

AYES—61

Bass	Higgins	Nolan
Blumenauer	Himes	Pallone
Braley (IA)	Holt	Payne
Clarke	Honda	Pelosi
Clay	Huffman	Pingree (ME)
Conyers	Jeffries	Pocan
Crowley	Lee (CA)	Roybal-Allard
DeFazio	Levin	Rush
DeGette	Lewis	Sánchez, Linda T.
Dingell	Lofgren	Sarbanes
Doggett	Lowey	Schakowsky
Doyle	Maloney, Carolyn	Schrader
Ellison	Matheson	Serrano
Eshoo	McCollum	Slaughter
Esty	McDermott	Speier
Farr	McGovern	Tierney
Fattah	Miller, George	Velázquez
Foster	Moore	Waters
Grijalva	Nadler	Watt
Gutierrez	Napolitano	Welch
Hastings (FL)		

NOES—362

Aderholt	Cooper	Hall
Alexander	Cotton	Hanabusa
Amash	Courtney	Hanna
Amodei	Cramer	Harper
Andrews	Crawford	Harris
Bachus	Crenshaw	Hartzler
Barber	Cuellar	Hastings (WA)
Barletta	Culberson	Heck (NV)
Barr	Cummings	Heck (WA)
Barrow (GA)	Daines	Hensarling
Barton	Davis (CA)	Herrera Beutler
Beatty	Davis, Danny	Hinojosa
Becerra	Davis, Rodney	Holding
Benishek	Delaney	Horsford
Bentivolio	DeLauro	Hoyer
Bera (CA)	DelBene	Hudson
Bilirakis	Denham	Huelskamp
Bishop (GA)	Dent	Huizenga (MI)
Bishop (NY)	DeSantis	Hultgren
Bishop (UT)	DesJarlais	Hunter
Black	Deutch	Hurt
Blackburn	Diaz-Balart	Israel
Bonamici	Duckworth	Issa
Bonner	Duffy	Jackson Lee
Boustany	Duncan (SC)	Jenkins
Brady (PA)	Duncan (TN)	Johnson (GA)
Brady (TX)	Ellmers	Johnson (OH)
Bridenstine	Engel	Johnson, E. B.
Brooks (AL)	Enyart	Johnson, Sam
Brooks (IN)	Farenthold	Jones
Broun (GA)	Fincher	Jordan
Brown (FL)	Fitzpatrick	Joyce
Brownley (CA)	Fleischmann	Kaptur
Buchanan	Fleming	Keating
Bucshon	Flores	Kelly (IL)
Burgess	Forbes	Kelly (PA)
Bustos	Fortenberry	Kennedy
Butterfield	Foxx	Kildee
Calvert	Frankel (FL)	Kilmer
Camp	Franks (AZ)	Kind
Cantor	Frelinghuysen	King (IA)
Capito	Gabbard	King (NY)
Capps	Gallego	Kingston
Capuano	Garamendi	Kinzinger (IL)
Cárdenas	Garcia	Kirkpatrick
Carney	Gardner	Kline
Carson (IN)	Garrett	Kuster
Carter	Gerlach	Labrador
Cartwright	Gibbs	LaMalfa
Cassidy	Gibson	Lamborn
Castor (FL)	Gingrey (GA)	Lance
Castro (TX)	Gohmert	Langevin
Chabot	Goodlatte	Lankford
Chaffetz	Gosar	Larsen (WA)
Cicilline	Gowdy	Larson (CT)
Cleaver	Granger	Latham
Clyburn	Graves (GA)	Latta
Coble	Graves (MO)	Lipinski
Coffman	Grayson	LoBiondo
Cohen	Green, Al	Loebsack
Cole	Green, Gene	Long
Collins (GA)	Griffin (AR)	Lowenthal
Collins (NY)	Griffith (VA)	Lucas
Conaway	Grimm	Luetkemeyer
Connolly	Guthrie	Lujan Grisham (NM)
Cook	Hahn	Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis	Pitts	Smith (MO)
Lynch	Polis	Smith (NE)
Maffei	Pompeo	Smith (NJ)
Maloney, Sean	Posey	Smith (TX)
Marchant	Price (GA)	Smith (WA)
Marino	Price (NC)	Southerland
Massie	Quigley	Stewart
Matsui	Radel	Stivers
McCarthy (CA)	Rahall	Stockman
McCaul	Rangel	Stutzman
McClintock	Reed	Swalwell (CA)
McHenry	Reichert	Takano
McIntyre	Renacci	Terry
McKeon	Ribble	Thompson (CA)
McKinley	Rice (SC)	Thompson (MS)
McMorris Rodgers	Richmond	Thompson (PA)
McNerney	Rigell	Thornberry
Meadows	Roby	Tiberi
Meehan	Roe (TN)	Tipton
Meeks	Rogers (AL)	Titus
Meng	Rogers (KY)	Tonko
Messer	Rogers (MI)	Tsongas
Mica	Rohrabacher	Turner
Michaud	Rokita	Upton
Miller (FL)	Rooney	Valadao
Miller (MI)	Ros-Lehtinen	Van Hollen
Miller, Gary	Roskam	Vargas
Moran	Ross	Veasey
Mullin	Rothfus	Vela
Mulvaney	Royce	Visclosky
Murphy (FL)	Ruiz	Wagner
Murphy (PA)	Runyan	Walberg
Negrete McLeod	Ruppersberger	Walden
Neugebauer	Ryan (OH)	Walorski
Noem	Ryan (WI)	Walz
Nugent	Salmon	Wasserman Schultz
Nunes	Sanchez, Loretta	Waxman
Nunnelee	Sanford	Weber (TX)
O'Rourke	Scalise	Webster (FL)
Olson	Schiff	Wenstrup
Owens	Schneider	Westmoreland
Palazzo	Schock	Whitfield
Pascrell	Schwartz	Williams
Pastor (AZ)	Schweikert	Wilson (FL)
Paulsen	Scott (VA)	Wilson (SC)
Pearce	Scott, Austin	Wittman
Perlmutter	Scott, David	Wolf
Perry	Sensenbrenner	Womack
Peters (CA)	Sessions	Woodall
Peters (MI)	Sewell (AL)	Yarmuth
Peterson	Sherman	Yoder
Petri	Shimkus	Yoho
Pittenger	Shuster	Young (AK)
	Simpson	Young (FL)
	Sinema	Young (IN)
	Sires	

NOT VOTING—11

Bachmann	Edwards	Neal
Campbell	Fudge	Poe (TX)
Chu	Markey	Shea-Porter
Costa	McCarthy (NY)	

□ 1152

Ms. LEE of California and Mr. CROWLEY changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 25 OFFERED BY MS. MCCOLLUM

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 134, noes 290, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 231]

AYES—134

Alexander
Andrews
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Becerra
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Braley (IA)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Camp
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cohen
Conyers
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Eshoo
Gardner
Gosar
Grayson
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Holt
Huizenga (MI)
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind
Kingston
Kirkpatrick
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Matheson
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Meeks
Meng
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Noem
Nolan
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters (MI)
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Quigley
Reichert
Richmond
Roby
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Sherman
Sinema
Slaughter
Speier
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Waters
Waxman

NOES—290

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Beatty
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Cantor
Capito
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castro (TX)
Chaffetz
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Hinojosa
Holding
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Kelly (PA)
Kilmer
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Napolitano
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Radel
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Titus
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—10

Bachmann
Campbell
Chu
Edwards
Fudge
Markey
McCarthy (NY)
Neal
Poe (TX)
Shea-Porter

□ 1156

Mr. CARDENAS changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

Mr. MAFFEI changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 32 OFFERED BY MR. NOLAN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 71, noes 353, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 232]

AYES—71

Amash
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Braley (IA)
Capuano
Clarke
Clay
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Cummings
DeFazio
DeGette
Doyle
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Grayson
Green, Gene
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Lee (CA)
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lummis
Maffei
Massie
Matsui
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Nadler
Nolan
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Quigley
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schrader
Serrano
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Tonko
Velázquez
Waters
Welch

NOES—353

Aderholt
Alexander
Amodei
Andrews
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cicilline
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Esty
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Griffin (AR)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Himes
Holding
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon

McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Napolitano
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Radel
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Scalise
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Takano
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—10

Bachmann
Campbell
Chu
Edwards
Fudge
Markey
McCarthy (NY)
Neal
Poe (TX)
Shea-Porter

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1200

Mr. ENGEL changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 33 OFFERED BY MR. LARSEN OF WASHINGTON

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. LARSEN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 195, noes 229, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 233]

AYES—195

Amash
Andrews
Barber
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—229

Aderholt
Alexander
Amodei
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schneider
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—10

Bachmann
Campbell
Chu
Edwards
Fudge
Markey
McCarthy (NY)
Neal
Poe (TX)
Shea-Porter

□ 1204

Mr. PERRY changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 36 OFFERED BY MR. GIBSON

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. GIBSON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 123, noes 301, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 234]

AYES—123

Aderholt
Amash
Bilirakis
Braley (IA)
Brooks (AL)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Burgess
Capps

Capuano
Carson (IN)
Chaffetz
Cicilline
Clarke
Coffman
Conyers
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Dingell
Doggett
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Enyart
Eshoo
Fitzpatrick
Fortenberry
Foxx
Garamendi
Gibson
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Harris
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kind
Labrador
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lowenthal
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Massie
Matsui
McClintock
McGovern
McHenry
Meadows
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Pocan
Polis
Posey
Radel
Reed
Ribble
Richmond
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothfus
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanford
Schrader
Schweikert
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Smith (NJ)
Speier
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tierney
Tonko
Tsongas
Walz
Webster (FL)
Welch
Whitfield
Yoho

NOES—301

Alexander
Amodei
Andrews
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Cárdenas
Carney
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
DeGette
Delaney
DelBene
Denham
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hensarling
Himes
Holding
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Joyce
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
Latta
Levin
Lewis
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McCollum
McDermott
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pittenger
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Roskam
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stewart
Stockman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tipton
Titus
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—10

Bachmann
Campbell
Chu
Edwards
Fudge
Markey
McCarthy (NY)
Neal
Poe (TX)
Shea-Porter

□ 1209

Ms. SINEMA changed her vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. LABRADOR, McHENRY, GUTIERREZ, and PERRY changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 37 OFFERED BY MR. COFFMAN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. COFFMAN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 110, noes 313, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 235]

AYES—110

Amash
Bass
Becerra
Benishek
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Braley (IA)
Brownley (CA)
Capuano
Carney
Cassidy
Chabot
Cicilline
Coffman
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Crowley
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
Deutch
Doggett
Doyle
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Eshoo
Fattah
Gabbard
Garrett
Gibson
Gohmert
Green, Gene
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Higgins
Himes
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jenkins
Jones
Jordan
Keating
Kind
Labrador
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Massie
McClintock
McCollum
McGovern
Meehan
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Nadler
Nolan
Pallone
Payne
Peters (MI)
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Quigley
Rahall
Ribble
Rigell
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Sánchez, Linda T.
Schakowsky
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Speier
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (PA)
Tierney
Tonko
Velázquez
Walz
Waters
Waxman
Woodall
Yarmuth

NOES—313

Aderholt
Alexander
Amodei
Andrews
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Beatty
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chaffetz
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Duckworth
Duffy
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Griffin (AR)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Holding
Horsford
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Joyce
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
Latta
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McDermott
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meeks
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin

Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Napolitano
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Radel
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stewart
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—11

Bachmann
Campbell
Chu
DeFazio
Edwards
Fudge
Markey
McCarthy (NY)
Neal
Poe (TX)
Shea-Porter

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1213

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 19 OFFERED BY MRS. WALORSKI

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 236, noes 188, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 236]

AYES—236

Aderholt
Alexander
Amodei
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (MI)
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—188

Amash
Andrews
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Lamborn
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Massie
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—10

Bachmann
Campbell
Chu
Edwards
Fudge
Markey
McCarthy (NY)
Neal
Poe (TX)
Shea-Porter

□ 1217

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 236 I inadvertently voted "nay" when I intended to Support the Amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF WASHINGTON

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 174, noes 249, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 237]

AYES—174

Amash
Andrews
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney

DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Frankel (FL)
Gabbard
Garamendi
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—249

Aderholt
Alexander
Amodei
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (MI)
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Scalise
Schneider
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—11

Bachmann
Campbell
Chu
Edwards
Fudge
Kuster
Markey
McCarthy (NY)
Neal
Poe (TX)
Shea-Porter

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining on this vote.

□ 1220

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 237, had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 150, noes 274, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 238]

AYES—150

Andrews
Barber
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Himes
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson, E. B.
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Meeks
Meng
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Peters (CA)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—274

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Enyart
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (PA)
Kilmer
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin

Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Waters
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—10

Bachmann
Campbell
Chu
Edwards
Fudge
Markey
McCarthy (NY)
Neal
Poe (TX)
Shea-Porter

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining on this vote.

□ 1223

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 146, noes 278, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 239]

AYES—146

Amash
Andrews
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Bustos
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson, E. B.
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kilmer
Kind
Kuster
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Nadler
Napolitano
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sherman
Slaughter
Speier
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Walz
Watt
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—278

Aderholt
Alexander
Amodei
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Delaney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Enyart
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Kelly (PA)
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—10

Bachmann
Campbell
Chu
Edwards
Fudge
Markey
McCarthy (NY)
Neal
Poe (TX)
Shea-Porter

□ 1227

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 39 OFFERED BY MR. VAN HOLLEN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 191, noes 232, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 240]

AYES—191

Amash
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Garamendi
Garcia
Garrett
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes

Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kuster
Labrador
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Ribble
Richmond
Rohrabacher
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoho

NOES—232

Aderholt
Alexander
Amodei
Andrews
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Schneider
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Takano
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—11

Bachmann
Campbell
Chu
Edwards
Fudge
Markey
McCarthy (NY)
Neal
Poe (TX)
Shea-Porter
Vargas

□ 1230

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 123 OFFERED BY MR. BLUMENAUER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 420, noes 3, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 241]

AYES—420

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Andrews
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas

Veasey	Waters	Wilson (SC)
Vela	Watt	Wittman
Velázquez	Waxman	Wolf
Visclosky	Weber (TX)	Womack
Wagner	Webster (FL)	Woodall
Walberg	Welch	Yarmuth
Walden	Wenstrup	Yoder
Walorski	Westmoreland	Yoho
Walz	Whitfield	Young (AK)
Wasserman Schultz	Williams	Young (FL)
	Wilson (FL)	Young (IN)

NOES—3

Duncan (TN)	Peterson	Price (GA)

NOT VOTING—11

Bachmann	Edwards	Neal
Campbell	Fudge	Poe (TX)
Chu	Markey	Shea-Porter
Coffman	McCarthy (NY)	

□ 1234

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 137 OFFERED BY MS. DELAURO

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 423, noes 0, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 242]

AYES—423

Aderholt	Bustos	Crowley
Alexander	Butterfield	Cuellar
Amash	Calvert	Culberson
Amodei	Camp	Cummings
Andrews	Cantor	Daines
Bachus	Capito	Davis (CA)
Barber	Capps	Davis, Danny
Barletta	Capuano	Davis, Rodney
Barr	Cárdenas	DeFazio
Barrow (GA)	Carney	DeGette
Barton	Carson (IN)	Delaney
Bass	Carter	DeLauro
Beatty	Cartwright	DelBene
Becerra	Cassidy	Denham
Benishek	Castor (FL)	Dent
Bentivolio	Castro (TX)	DeSantis
Bera (CA)	Chabot	DesJarlais
Bilirakis	Chaffetz	Deutch
Bishop (GA)	Cicilline	Diaz-Balart
Bishop (NY)	Clarke	Dingell
Bishop (UT)	Clay	Doggett
Black	Cleaver	Doyle
Blackburn	Clyburn	Duckworth
Blumenauer	Coble	Duffy
Bonamici	Cohen	Duncan (SC)
Bonner	Cole	Duncan (TN)
Boustany	Collins (GA)	Ellison
Brady (PA)	Collins (NY)	Ellmers
Brady (TX)	Conaway	Engel
Braley (IA)	Connolly	Enyart
Bridenstine	Conyers	Eshoo
Brooks (AL)	Cook	Esty
Brooks (IN)	Cooper	Farenthold
Broun (GA)	Costa	Farr
Brown (FL)	Cotton	Fattah
Brownley (CA)	Courtney	Fincher
Buchanan	Cramer	Fitzpatrick
Bucshon	Crawford	Fleischmann
Burgess	Crenshaw	Fleming
Flores	Lee (CA)	Ribble
Forbes	Levin	Rice (SC)
Fortenberry	Lewis	Richmond
Foster	Lipinski	Rigell
Foxx	LoBiondo	Roby
Frankel (FL)	Loebsack	Roe (TN)
Franks (AZ)	Lofgren	Rogers (AL)
Frelinghuysen	Long	Rogers (KY)
Gabbard	Lowenthal	Rogers (MI)
Gallego	Lowey	Rohrabacher
Garamendi	Lucas	Rokita
Garcia	Luetkemeyer	Rooney
Gardner	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Ros-Lehtinen
Garrett	Luján, Ben Ray (NM)	Roskam
Gerlach	Lummis	Ross
Gibbs	Lynch	Rothfus
Gibson	Maffei	Roybal-Allard
Gingrey (GA)	Maloney, Carolyn	Royce
Gohmert	Maloney, Sean	Ruiz
Goodlatte	Marchant	Runyan
Gosar	Marino	Ruppersberger
Gowdy	Massie	Rush
Granger	Matheson	Ryan (OH)
Graves (GA)	Matsui	Ryan (WI)
Graves (MO)	McCarthy (CA)	Salmon
Grayson	McCaul	Sánchez, Linda T.
Green, Al	McClintock	Sanchez, Loretta
Green, Gene	McCollum	Sanford
Griffin (AR)	McDermott	Sarbanes
Griffith (VA)	McGovern	Scalise
Grijalva	McHenry	Schakowsky
Grimm	McIntyre	Schiff
Guthrie	McKeon	Schneider
Gutierrez	McKinley	Schock
Hahn	McMorris Rodgers	Schrader
Hall	McNerney	Schwartz
Hanabusa	Meadows	Schweikert
Hanna	Meehan	Scott (VA)
Harper	Meeks	Scott, Austin
Harris	Meng	Scott, David
Hartzler	Messer	Sensenbrenner
Hastings (FL)	Mica	Serrano
Hastings (WA)	Michaud	Sessions
Heck (NV)	Miller (FL)	Sewell (AL)
Heck (WA)	Miller (MI)	Sherman
Hensarling	Miller, Gary	Shimkus
Herrera Beutler	Miller, George	Shuster
Higgins	Moore	Simpson
Himes	Moran	Sinema
Hinojosa	Mullin	Sires
Holding	Mulvaney	Slaughter
Holt	Murphy (FL)	Smith (MO)
Honda	Murphy (PA)	Smith (NE)
Horsford	Nadler	Smith (NJ)
Hoyer	Napolitano	Smith (TX)
Hudson	Negrete McLeod	Smith (WA)
Huelskamp	Neugebauer	Southerland
Huffman	Noem	Speier
Huizenga (MI)	Nolan	Stewart
Hultgren	Nugent	Stivers
Hunter	Nunes	Stockman
Hurt	Nunnelee	Stutzman
Israel	O'Rourke	Swalwell (CA)
Issa	Olson	Takano
Jackson Lee	Owens	Terry
Jeffries	Palazzo	Thompson (CA)
Jenkins	Pallone	Thompson (MS)
Johnson (GA)	Pascrell	Thompson (PA)
Johnson (OH)	Pastor (AZ)	Thornberry
Johnson, E. B.	Paulsen	Tiberi
Johnson, Sam	Payne	Tierney
Jones	Pearce	Tipton
Jordan	Pelosi	Titus
Joyce	Perlmutter	Tonko
Kaptur	Perry	Tsongas
Keating	Peters (CA)	Turner
Kelly (IL)	Peters (MI)	Upton
Kelly (PA)	Peterson	Valadao
Kennedy	Petri	Van Hollen
Kildee	Pingree (ME)	Vargas
Kilmer	Pittenger	Veasey
Kind	Pitts	Vela
King (IA)	Pocan	Velázquez
King (NY)	Polis	Visclosky
Kingston	Pompeo	Wagner
Kinzinger (IL)	Posey	Walberg
Kirkpatrick	Price (GA)	Walden
Kline	Price (NC)	Walorski
Kuster	Quigley	Walz
Labrador	Radel	Wasserman Schultz
LaMalfa	Rahall	Waters
Lamborn	Rangel	Watt
Lance	Reed	Waxman
Langevin	Reichert	Weber (TX)
Lankford	Renacci	Webster (FL)
Larsen (WA)		Welch
Larson (CT)		Wenstrup
Latham		Westmoreland
Latta		Whitfield
		Williams
		Wilson (FL)
		Wilson (SC)
		Wittman
		Wolf
		Womack
		Woodall
		Yarmuth
		Yoder
		Yoho
		Young (AK)
		Young (FL)
		Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—11

Bachmann	Edwards	Neal
Campbell	Fudge	Poe (TX)
Chu	Markey	Shea-Porter
Coffman	McCarthy (NY)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1237

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Chair, on rollcall Nos. 241 and 242, I was unavoidably detained.

Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes.''

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. CAPITO) having assumed the chair, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1960) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2014 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 260, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

□ 1240

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Ms. DUCKWORTH. I am opposed in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title V, add the following new section:

SEC. 5___. CONVENING AUTHORITY RELIANCE ON OFFICE OF THE CHIEF PROSECUTOR RECOMMENDATION TO PROCEED TO TRIAL OF ANY CHARGE INVOLVING SEXUAL ASSAULT OR OTHER SEX-RELATED OFFENSE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 834 of title 10, United States Code (article 34 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d); and

(2) by inserting after the subsection (b) the following new subsection (c):

''(c)(1) In the case of any charge involving sexual assault or other sex-related offense covered by section 920, 920a, 920b, or 920c of this title (article 120, 120a, 120b, or 120c of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), the convening authority shall also refer the charge to the Office of the Chief Prosecutor of the armed force of which the accused is a member for additional consideration and advice unless the victim (or the parent or legal guardian of the victim if the victim is a minor) of such offense elects that such charge only be referred to the staff judge advocate pursuant to subsection (a).

''(2) If the Office of the Chief Prosecutor is referred a charge covered by paragraph (1) and recommends that the charge be referred to trial, the recommendation shall be binding on the convening authority and the convening authority shall promptly direct a trial of the charge.''.

(b) APPOINTMENT OF CHIEF PROSECUTOR.—For any Armed Force for which the position of Chief Prosecutor does not exist before the date of the enactment of this Act, the Judge Advocate General of that Armed Force shall establish the position of Chief Prosecutor and appoint as the Chief Prosecutor a commissioned officer in the grade of O–6 or above who has significant experience prosecuting sexual assault trials by court-martial.

Mrs. WALORSKI (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Madam Speaker, the willingness of our troops to place the Nation first is why the scourge of sexual harassment and assault in the military is so horrific. Just a single case is unacceptable. This is a self-inflicted wound that has no place in the greatest military in the world.

I love the military with every bone in my body. The lessons I learned as an army officer, the camaraderie I experienced are at the core of who I am, just as it is for my brothers and sisters in arms. That is why I am personally devastated to see how many predators continue to abuse and attack one of our own.

The military is a place of great discipline, technical proficiency, and personal sacrifice for the greater good. It is a place where young men and women grow and thrive, developing as great leaders and team members. This is the case for so many of them. However, for some, the military has now become a place of fear and intimidation.

The services have made significant efforts to try to stamp out sexual harassment and assault, but there are still unacceptable failures in these efforts. With each new piece of data on the rates of sexual assault and on the lack of command responsibility by many in dealing with military sexual trauma, I have gradually come to the conclusion that we need another path to protect the victims.

This amendment adds a new course of action for victims to pursue should they choose it. It empowers them at a time when they feel most powerless with a new option that is outside the chain of command with an independent investigation and prosecution system.

I place the highest priority on the importance of a commander's authority to lead and discipline the men and women under his or her command. However, in the case of sexual crimes, there continues to be failures in the existing processes for investigations and punishments within that chain. That is why we must empower victims with an additional choice so that they can seek justice.

There are many, many good commanders. My own experience has been a positive one with all of my commanders, all of whom were men, being protective of all of their soldiers and doing the right thing. Yet the data shows that there are enough predators and failed commanders that we need to take care of this now. This solution supports command authority but also, importantly, empowers victims by giving them one more option.

The men and women in our Armed Forces are why we live freely in the greatest country in the world. When our warriors face combat, they must be able to focus completely and single-mindedly on the mission at hand. They cannot do this if they are threatened with sexual assault.

When our Nation's parents are approached by their brave young son or daughter who is looking to join the military, these moms and dads need to know without a doubt that their child will be cared for, that they will become disciplined, well-trained leaders. They should not have to fear that their child will become a rape victim.

The military is a place of honor, one where our troops serve with great pride. This amendment is a balanced approach that honors our military by providing the victim with a choice on how to seek justice.

Madam Speaker, at this time, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlelady from California, who's been a leader in victims' rights, Ms. SPEIER.

Ms. SPEIER. I thank the heroic lady from Illinois, and I think, for all of us, hearing your words are profound.

What we are seeing here is, not only are there physical wounds, there are emotional wounds. So many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle have shared with me the stories of victims who have been raped and sexually assaulted—the fear, the pain, the tears—and they all, to the woman and to the man, have said how powerless they feel.

This particular amendment will give them a little leverage. This amendment is going to give them a choice. This amendment respects the chain of command. This amendment gives them the opportunity to use the chain of command or to seek to go to the chief prosecutor in each of the services to seek an investigation and an evaluation as to whether or not a prosecution should move forward.

We have an opportunity here to really change the face of this issue, and I urge my colleagues to join in supporting this amendment.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Ladies and gentlemen, colleagues, we worked for months on bipartisan legislation to confront this problem. The time for this Congress to act on this issue is right now. I ask you to support the bipartisan solution in this bill, reject the procedural motion to recommit, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by a 5-minute vote on passage of the bill, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 194, noes 225, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 243]

AYES—194

Andrews	Clyburn	Foster
Barber	Cohen	Frankel (FL)
Barrow (GA)	Connolly	Gabbard
Bass	Conyers	Gallego
Beatty	Cooper	Garamendi
Becerra	Costa	Garcia
Bera (CA)	Courtney	Grayson
Bishop (GA)	Crowley	Green, Al
Bishop (NY)	Cuellar	Green, Gene
Blumenauer	Cummings	Grijalva
Bonamici	Davis (CA)	Hahn
Brady (PA)	Davis, Danny	Hanabusa
Braley (IA)	DeFazio	Hastings (FL)
Brown (FL)	DeGette	Heck (WA)
Brownley (CA)	Delaney	Higgins
Bustos	DeLauro	Himes
Butterfield	DelBene	Hinojosa
Capps	Deutch	Holt
Capuano	Dingell	Honda
Cárdenas	Doggett	Horsford
Carney	Doyle	Hoyer
Carson (IN)	Duckworth	Huffman
Cartwright	Ellison	Israel
Castor (FL)	Engel	Jackson Lee
Castro (TX)	Enyart	Jeffries
Cicilline	Eshoo	Johnson (GA)
Clarke	Esty	Johnson, E. B.
Clay	Farr	Jones
Cleaver	Fattah	Kaptur

Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—225

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Sanchez, Loretta

NOT VOTING—14

Bachmann
Bachus
Campbell
Chu
Edwards
Fudge
Gohmert
Gutierrez
Issa
Markey
McCarthy (NY)
Neal
Poe (TX)
Shea-Porter

□ 1254

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 315, noes 108, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 244]

AYES—315

Aderholt
Alexander
Amodei
Andrews
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Beatty
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Cárdenas
Carney
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clay
Cleaver
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Duckworth
Duffy
Ellmers
Enyart
Esty
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Griffin (AR)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Holding
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McDermott
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pascrell
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Scalise
Schneider
Schock
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Takano
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Waters
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—108

Amash
Bass
Becerra
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Cicilline
Clarke
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Crowley
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Deutch
Doyle
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Gibson
Gohmert
Gosar
Grayson
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Huffman
Keating
Kennedy
Kildee
Labrador
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lummis
Lynch
Massie
Matsui
McClintock
McCollum
McGovern
Meeks
Meng
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Nadler
Napolitano
Nolan
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Quigley
Radel
Rangel
Richmond
Rohrabacher
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schweikert
Serrano
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Stockman
Swalwell (CA)

Thompson (CA)	Velázquez	Welch
Thompson (MS)	Wasserman Schultz	Wilson (FL)
Tierney	Watt	Yarmuth
Tonko	Waxman	Yoho
Van Hollen		

NOT VOTING—11

Bachmann	Fudge	Neal
Campbell	Green, Gene	Poe (TX)
Chu	Markey	Shea-Porter
Edwards	McCarthy (NY)	

□ 1307

Mrs. LUMMIS changed her vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: ''A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2014 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 244 final passage, had I been present, I would have voted ''yes.''

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 1960, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to make technical corrections in the engrossment of H.R. 1960, to include corrections in spelling, punctuation, section numbering and cross-referencing, and the insertion of appropriate headings.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DAINES). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

□ 1310

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield to my friend the majority leader, Mr. CANTOR from Virginia, for the purpose of inquiring of the schedule for the week to come.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland, the Democratic whip, for yielding.

Last week, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Maryland was kind enough to note and celebrate my birthday with a colloquy, and luckily, I get to return the favor today. So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say happy birthday to my friend, Mr. HOYER, and wish him many, many more birthdays.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, I want to thank the gentleman for his kindness. The American public must be thinking Geminis are, indeed, schizophrenic. I thank my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet at noon for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Tuesday and Wednesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning hour and noon for legislative business. On Thursday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m. On Friday, no votes are expected.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a few suspensions next week, a complete list of which will be announced by close of business today. In addition, the House will consider H.R. 1797, the Pain Capable Unborn Child Protection Act. I also expect the House to consider H.R. 1947, the Federal Agricultural Reform and Risk Management Act. Chairman FRANK LUCAS and the members of the Agriculture Committee have worked very hard to produce a 5-year farm bill with strong reforms, and I look forward to a full debate on the floor.

I thank the gentleman and wish him a happy birthday again.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his good wishes. I thank him for the information. If I can ask him a question initially about the farm bill, which has obviously been very controversial in the past, still remains controversial in many ways, and I'm wondering, in light of the fact that the Senate passed a farm bill in a pretty bipartisan way, 66–27, with 18 Republicans voting in favor, but I know the Speaker has observed the divisions within the Republican Conference, and obviously there are some divisions within our caucus as well, and I'm wondering whether or not in fact the gentleman is confident that we will get to completion and a vote on the farm bill next week.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I would respond by saying that it's certainly our intention to complete deliberation on the farm bill. The Speaker has continued to commit himself and our conference to an open process for this House, and I look forward to a robust debate on what, as the gentleman knows, has been a bipartisan effort at the committee.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comment. As the gentleman knows, on our side of the aisle, there is very significant concern about the status of the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, and I would hope that as a rule is considered on that bill, I don't know whether the gentleman knows at this point in time, that we would have an opportunity to have a significant number of amendments on that bill to reflect the House working its will, as the Speaker has so often observed, and I yield to my friend for whatever information he may have. I know that the rule has not been written, and I don't know whether he has any insights on how much flexibility there will be on the rule.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. I would respond by saying that I do think there is a commitment to genuine and robust debate on all sides. And hopefully, without speaking to details because, as the gentleman knows, the Rules Committee has not met, that would include all subject matter in the bill.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that and look forward to that because I know on both sides of the aisle, this is a bill that has strong feelings among different perspectives on this bill and with respect to different subjects. And so I think as open a rule process and debate process as is possible will be helpful to the final product. I would hope that we can follow that.

Mr. Leader, you mentioned the Unborn Pain bill. I understand and I have some information that says that the text of that bill coming out of committee may be modified in the Rules Committee. Is the gentleman aware of that? And if so, is the gentleman aware of what textual change there may be from the bill that was reported out of the committee?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

There has been a lot of discussion that I have been receiving, comments, input from Members, and we're looking at weighing those suggestions and inputs as to how the Rules Committee will deliberate in terms of the rule and how the bill comes to the floor.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman. His comment reflects what I've heard. There is a lot of discussion going on about this. Hopefully we would get significant notice of what changes there might be. Can the gentleman tell me, would it be safe to assume that this bill will be considered, when and if considered, no earlier than Wednesday, and will be considered Wednesday and Thursday? And I say that, I will tell you, some of my Members who are very concerned about this bill are very concerned about when it might be brought up, the timing from their perspectives. This is a very serious piece of legislation, as the gentleman knows, again from all perspectives, and I would hope that this bill would be, in light of the fact that the Rules Committee will probably deal with it—I'm not sure whether they'll deal with it on Tuesday; my presumption is they'll deal with it on Tuesday—but there will be time for proponents and opponents of whatever changes might be recommended to prepare their arguments for the floor.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and would respond by saying, as has been the custom in this Congress and last, we will continue to abide by the 3-day notice, and I do think there will be adequate time for review by parties on all sides.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that answer, and I thank him for the fact that you will be following the notice rule that has been discussed. I would ask the majority leader, could I be confident in advising people who are very focused on this bill, that if they are here Wednesday, that they will be in time to consider that bill? In other words, do you expect that the Rules Committee would consider this bill before tonight?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I do think that the posting of the bill will occur shortly. And I also would tell the gentleman to expect the vote sooner than Wednesday, perhaps on Tuesday. As the gentleman indicated before by his question on the farm bill, that may take up a considerable amount of time and debate. So I would just respond in that way.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his answer. So that in an abundance of caution, proponents or opponents would need to be here by Tuesday. I thank him for that answer.

Let me ask an additional thing that is similar to my question on the farm bill. We are very, very hopeful that the bill we have just been discussing, whether it's considered Tuesday, Wednesday or Thursday, is subject to a somewhat open rule. I don't expect it to be fully open, but that amendments will be made in order. There are very strong feelings on both sides. That's why the gentleman has indicated there's a lot of discussion going on on his side and on my side. I would hope that we have the ability again for the House to work its will and that we would have the ability to offer such amendments as would be relevant, and important amendments, not specious amendments but very important amendments, to be considered by the House, and I yield to my friend.

□ 1320

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman again.

It has always been the commitment on the part of the Speaker and the majority to try and accommodate the need for open debate on issues of contention especially; and not speaking for the Rules Committee, I do think that we'll continue to see that tradition in the House being followed. Again, I thank the gentleman for raising the concern.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman, and I feel constrained to add, however, on the defense bill that we just considered, yes, it was bipartisan to the extent that both sides agreed on a formulation on the sexual assault issue within the military.

Very frankly, there were two very substantive, widely supported, widely discussed amendments that were requested, one by Ms. SPEIER from California and one by Ms. GABBARD from Hawaii. Neither one of those was made an amendment so that the only alternative that we had available to us was the committee agreed-upon alternative with respect to sexual assault complaints that women in the military or men in the military might have.

Then a very substantive and, I thought, well-thought out motion to recommit, which was deemed by the individual on your side of the aisle who opposed it, in an almost cursory fashion, less than, I think, 120 seconds, dismissed as a procedural motion.

With all due respect to the majority leader, and it was not the majority leader, obviously, it was anything but a procedural motion. It was a very substantive motion. It would have, in my opinion—of course we can differ on that, but my opinion, would have made a very positive improvement in the piece of legislation we were considering.

Now, I voted for the piece of legislation, the defense bill. I've never voted against a defense authorization in my career here. The national security of our Nation is critically important.

But we had somebody offer that amendment who served in the military, who gave two of her legs for our country, and who has been honored for her service, both in the military, as an officer, a helicopter pilot, and for her service to veterans, both in Illinois and in our country. And very frankly, that was rejected as a procedural motion.

I understand the gentleman's representation that we follow the tradition of giving a full and fair—but if, I say, with all due respect to the majority leader, if the motions to recommit are to be considered simply as procedural motions, which the gentleman will observe we did not do when we were in the majority, we understand, and some of our Members understood, that these amendments made a difference.

And once we got rid of the procedural impediment that a motion to recommit would send the bill back to committee, which is no longer the case, then we should consider very legitimate alternatives on a substantive basis, not the procedural objections that we were confronted with today.

I say that all to say this is a critically important bill, very strong feelings on all sides, and I would—the gentleman has said this, and I take him at his word, that we allow alternatives to be considered on this floor as amendments that are not perceived as procedural, but are perceived as substantive attempts to improve, from the offerer of the amendment's perspective, the piece of legislation before us.

If the gentleman wants to make any additional comments, I'll yield.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Just very quickly I would respond by saying that the gentleman is correct. There has been a lot of debate around the issue that he refers to. There was considerable debate in the HASC committee, and the HASC committee, House Armed Services, came up with a bipartisan approach to the sexual assault issue, and it was inserted into the base bill. And, in fact, it is consistent with President Obama's view and the Pentagon's view on this issue.

So I understand that the gentleman may differ, but it was certainly a bipartisan product that was in the bill. And I hear the gentleman in terms of procedure and perhaps a characterization of a vote; but I do think, at the end, the minority was afforded the motion to recommit.

And the characterization that we believe is a procedural vote, the gentleman takes another view. I understand that the subject matter was the same as these amendments, and these amendments that were not brought forward on the floor were heavily discussed in committee, resolved on a bipartisan basis.

So, again, I understand the gentleman's point and look forward to continuing to do all we can to safeguard the women in our military, and to make sure that we protect all American citizens, which I do think this bipartisan resolution of the issue will do.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments. I understand that you do view the motion to recommit as procedural. We disagree on that.

The motion would make a substantive difference in the piece of legislation. It would have set up a different scenario. To that extent, it was clearly substantive and not procedural; and it would have, I think, comported with, from many on our side's perspective, a better process to protect women and men from arbitrary and perhaps, at some point in time, unfair treatment and would give them a choice of what avenue they would pursue to protect themselves.

And as Ms. DUCKWORTH, Captain DUCKWORTH, Congresswoman DUCKWORTH so aptly stated, would give more confidence, particularly to women, but men and women entering into the service that they would be protected.

We don't need to debate the substance of the issue, simply to say that giving us the alternative, and the MTR gave us the alternative, but it was not considered, on your side, as a substantive alternative.

Therefore, my point being, on the bill that we're talking about, the Pain Bill, referred to shorthand as the Pain Bill, that we be given substantive amendments that are not perceived as procedural, so that the House, not 20 percent of the House—the Armed Services Committee is less than 20 percent of the House—not the Armed Services Committee, or any committee, for that matter, dispose of the issue and preclude the other 80 percent of us from participating in making that decision.

So I would urge my friend to urge the Rules Committee and the leadership, of which the gentleman is a principal leader, to allow substantive amendments, good-faith amendments to be made in order.

Two more things if I can, unless the gentleman wants to say something further. Let me say something on immigration reform. PAUL RYAN, leader on your side, a Vice Presidential candidate, said of the bipartisan effort in the Senate on immigration, he said, ''I do support what they're doing. I think they've put out a good product. It's good policy.'' That was reported on June 6 of this year in The Hill newspaper.

Immigration, obviously, nor did I expect it to be on the list for next week. But I want to ask the gentleman—in light of the fact that comprehensive immigration reform, by many on both sides of the aisle, including Mr. RYAN, but obviously in a bipartisan way in the United States Senate, has been something that's been viewed as a priority item—can the gentleman tell me whether or not there is a near-term, and by ''near-term,'' I mean prior to the August break, expectation that we will have any movement in this House on immigration reform?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman and would say that the Judiciary Committee, under the leadership of Chairman GOODLATTE, is very, very involved in the discussion around these issues and is intending to address and begin to address the issue of immigration this month. And certainly my hope is that we, in this House, can see a full debate on the floor throughout the committee process and to make sure that we can address what is a very broken immigration system.

And I know that the gentleman shares with me the commitment to try and do all we can to reflect the notion of trying to address a broken system.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for those comments, and I look forward to us doing that and, hopefully, doing so in a bipartisan fashion because he and I both agree that the system is broken, needs to be fixed.

And my view, and I think the view of many, and certainly the Senators who came together and offered the bill that's now being considered on the Senate floor, believe that a comprehensive plan was the best answer. And I agree with that.

Lastly, if I can ask the majority leader, the student loan program, which has capped interest on student loans at 3.4 percent, expires the end of this month, and therefore we're weeks away from having a substantial increase, a doubling of student loan costs.

□ 1330

The President has a proposal. We passed a proposal through this House, as you know, Mr. Leader. Both of those proposals were defeated on the Senate floor for lack of 60 votes. The Senate alternative, which Mr. BISHOP has now introduced, got 51 votes, but neither of them got 60 votes.

Can the gentleman tell me whether or not—it's not on the calendar for next week—there's any plan to address the issue, beyond what we've already done and which has been rejected in the Senate, to ensure that students do not see a doubling of interest rates in the near future?

And I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman and would say that, yes, there is a commitment to try to make sure that there is not a doubling of the interest rate to students who would look to incurring debt to go to school.

As the gentleman correctly knows, Mr. Speaker, this House is the only body that has passed a bill to provide for protecting these students against such a rate increase. In fact, the bill that passed the House, as the gentleman knows, was a bill that allows for rates to go into a variable mode, to assure that any increase that would occur is not that increase in the statute, but long term could protect students as well from that kind of a hit.

Now, I've talked to several members of the administration. Our chairman, JOHN KLINE, has been in contact, I know, with the Secretary, as well as others, in trying to resolve this issue. Discussions are ongoing. It is my hope, I would tell the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, that we can resolve this issue so that perspective students can be assured that their rates would not double. But it is the House who has provided the pathway and the roadmap to ensure that happens. And we're trying to work with the administration, since the Senate has been unable to act, to avoid this from happening.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, I'm sure you know—and I'm sure the American public knows as well, Mr. Speaker—the reason the Senate hasn't acted is because, although they have a majority for an alternative, frankly, they can't get cloture. They can't get 60 votes. Frankly, Mr. REID doesn't have 60 votes in order to move legislation.

So, while it's well and good to say that we have acted, we have acted on a vehicle that the Senate has rejected. And they've rejected our alternative as well. They didn't reject it by a majority vote. A majority voted for our alternative. Frankly, the House would not be able to act if 60 percent of the House were necessary to pass something, and the majority leader and I both know that. We would be in gridlock. Frankly, I think it's unfortunate the Senate has a rule which allows a minority to control. I think that's not good for the country, I think it's not good for democracy, and I think it is not good for policy. I think that's demonstrable and, unfortunately, being experienced by the American people.

But I would hope that within the next 2 weeks, or 8 legislative days that we have left, that the gentleman's efforts will bear fruit and that we can do something—not that we'll beat ourselves on the chest and say the House acted.

That's the problem with the sequester. The House acted in the last Congress, and we're not acting now because a bill that's dead and gone and cannot be resurrected was passed in the last Congress as a pretense of—not a pretense. It was real at the time, but now claiming that that is the reason we're not acting on the sequester. Hopefully, that will not be the reason we do not act on the student loan.

I thank the gentleman for his efforts at wanting to get us to a compromise which will assure that students do not see, on July 1, an increase in their interest rates.

Unless the gentleman wants to make additional comments, I will yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JUNE 17, 2013

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces that the correct tally on rollcall vote No. 231 was 134 ''ayes'' and 290 ''noes.''

KENTUCKY BOURBON INDUSTRY

(Mr. BARR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, in honor of National Bourbon Day, I rise to celebrate Kentucky's signature spirit.

Kentucky's signature bourbon industry has enjoyed significant growth domestically and abroad, creating billions of dollars in economic activity and over 9,000 jobs, including thousands in the legendary distilleries along the Kentucky Bourbon Trail.

Unlike vodka or gin, bourbon is required by law to be stored for at least 2 years in charred white oak barrels. However, bourbon distillers are unable to deduct their expenses during that unique aging process, placing them at a competitive disadvantage in the global marketplace.

This week, I introduced a bipartisan Aged Distilled Spirits Competitiveness Act, which would amend the Tax Code to fix this inequality and help level the playing field for Kentucky's signature bourbon industry.

American products can successfully compete with any in the world. This House is working overtime to enact policies that will promote American competitiveness, remove barriers to

job creation, and spur this Nation's economy. I am confident that, with the right tax policy, we will produce even more growth and job creation for the people of Kentucky.

STOP THE MEDDLING IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

(Ms. NORTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, Representative PHIL GINGREY of Georgia filed a National Defense Authorization bill amendment that was included in en bloc amendments expressing the sense of the Congress that Active Duty military personnel in their private capacity should be exempt from the gun laws of the District of Columbia, but not those of any other State or locality. This antidemocratic amendment continues a pattern of Republican assault on D.C.'s local rights and gun safety laws. But we have shown we know how to fight back. We defeated the Gingrey amendment last Congress, and we will work with our Senate allies to defeat it again.

Today, after Newtown, when there have been serious attempts to toughen gun laws across the country and even here in the Congress, the Gingrey amendment goes in the opposite direction and attempts to use Active Duty personnel to further his own gun agenda.

Rather than addressing the needs of his own Georgia constituents, PHIL GINGREY is spending his time meddling in a district more than 600 miles away from his. If there were a problem involving guns and our Active Duty military, he would not target only the District of Columbia.

The District will not be used to further the agenda of Members of Congress unaccountable to our residents. We particularly resent being used as fodder by a Member in his campaign for the Senate.

A TRIBUTE TO BEN GETTLER

(Mr. WENSTRUP asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, I had the good fortune of getting to know Ben Gettler during years of pickup basketball games with him.

Ben's philosophy about basketball wasn't too different from his philosophy about life: age is no reason to slow down. Ben was still running a business and two charitable foundations up to his final days with us. He passed away on June 4 at age 87.

Ben grew up during a tumultuous time in our world's history. The experiences of his era imprinted upon him the importance of his heritage and shaped his philanthropic pursuits.

As the president of the Jewish Foundation of Cincinnati, Ben organized a program that helped more young men and women per capita to travel to Israel than any other city in North America.

Ben also gave back to his alma mater, the University of Cincinnati, by serving as the chairman of the board of trustees. Today, Gettler Stadium at the university stands as a tribute to Ben and his wife Dee's service to the University, as well as a reminder of his time in college as an outstanding track-and-field athlete.

A grateful city thanks Ben's wife, Dee, and his children for sharing this energetic and passionate man with our community. The city of Cincinnati is truly a better place because of Ben Gettler. He will be missed, but he will never be forgotten.

□ 1340

AMENDMENTS 125 AND 131 TO THE NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014

(Mr. SCHNEIDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, this week we took up the National Defense Authorization Act, and I was glad to join with my colleagues in working to improve the bill to meet emerging needs. Specifically, I want to thank the committee for the inclusion of two amendments which I authored in regards to Iran and Syria.

The first amendment will clarify what effect international sanctions are having on Iran's military capacity. We know that Iran is currently capable of exporting military technology and resources to its threat network abroad. Our sanctions must continue to press and place pressure on the Iranian regime to limit its global reach. This amendment will provide clarity as to what extent Iran's military capacity is being degraded by U.S. and international sanctions.

The second amendment will put a renewed emphasis on how we approach policy options towards the conflict in Syria. The administration revealed yesterday that chemical weapons have been used by the Assad regime on its own people.

This amendment would urge the President to limit all arms trafficking into Syria from Iran, Lebanon, and Russia. With the escalation of tensions in Syria, this important amendment will provide a necessary condition for addressing future actions in the region.

I again want to thank the committee for adopting these important policy provisions.

HOPE LIVES AT CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL OF PHILADELPHIA

(Mr. FITZPATRICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the Children's Hospital of Philadelphia, which has earned the number one ranking among the Nation's pediatric hospitals in the latest U.S. News and World Report Honor Roll of Best Children's Hospitals. CHOP programs also were ranked within the top four in each of 10 specialty areas in the U.S. News survey.

This recognition is a milestone for the largest and oldest children's hospital in the world and a credit to the dedication and expertise of the staff, whose mission is defined by the hospital motto: Hope Lives Here.

And hope is what was involved in the recent double lung transplant performed by CHOP physicians on 10-year-old Sarah Murnaghan, whose plight received national attention.

I also acknowledge the patient care provided at the satellite Children's Hospital in Chalfont, Bucks County, an outpatient facility serving the families of Bucks County and eastern Montgomery County. And so I congratulate the entire staff of the Children's Hospital of Philadelphia for this achievement and look forward to your many years of continued service and success.

REPEAL OBAMACARE

(Mr. STUTZMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, schools across this country should be focused on educating our children; but, unfortunately, they're struggling because ObamaCare is forcing them to cut hours for part-time workers.

In Indiana, hundreds of part-time workers, including substitute teachers, cafeteria workers, bus drivers, and coaches, will face fewer hours and smaller paychecks. It's not just schools. Back home, many working families tell me more and more employers are making the tough decision to cut back hours, hold back projects, and take a pass on hiring.

This administration sold ObamaCare as a benefit to hardworking, middle class Americans; but it's hurting the very families it was designed to help.

Hoosiers don't need more regulations or mandates. We need real solutions that empower patients instead of crippling schools. Our students deserve the tools they need to succeed, and that isn't possible when Washington puts regulations ahead of achievement.

Teachers, mechanics, grocers, farmers and steel makers, all of them need an exemption from Washington's madness. Let's repeal ObamaCare, and let educators focus on what's really important—our kids.

PLAN B UNRESTRICTED BY FDA

(Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in opposition to the decision on Monday by

the FDA to allow Plan B to be offered over the counter to girls at any age. I've been vocal about this issue and will continue to be. On May 20 this year, I co-authored a letter to the Commissioner of the U.S. Food and Drug Administration asking the FDA to reverse its decision. At one point, the President agreed that Plan B should not be used over the counter by girls without a prescription. Now it seems he has changed his mind.

As a result of this FDA ruling, it will be easier for young girls to get Plan B than it will to get a tattoo. Mr. Speaker, this change is an insult to parents and the role they play in their children's lives. I am very disappointed with the FDA's decision to allow Plan B to be offered over the counter without age restriction.

FOREIGN—NOT DOMESTIC—INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to discuss shocking revelations reported in the media starting last Wednesday, that is 9 days ago, and continuing for several days afterward, regarding the scope of the NSA's spying program, including both foreigners and Americans.

The NSA is the National Security Agency. Its duty is, as part of DOD, to protect us against foreign attacks, just as DOD itself is supposed to protect us against foreign attacks. And DOD, like the CIA, is on the side of the firewall dealing with foreign threats as opposed to the FBI and the Justice Department who deal with domestic threats.

As of a week ago last Wednesday, the Guardian reported that a particular court order had ordered Verizon, the largest cellular telephone company in America, to turn over its call records for all of its calls—all of its calls.

I have the document from the Guardian's Web site here in front of me. It is a document that is issued as a secondary order by what's known as the FISA Court. That court is the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court established under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act.

Let's start with the name of the court, the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court. As the name of the act implies, the jurisdiction of the court is limited to foreign surveillance and foreign threats. This is by statute.

The order itself was printed and posted at the Web site. Millions of people have seen it since then. What it purports to be—I say purports to be, but, in fact, the agency involved in the NSA has not denied that this is a valid, real document—it says that the court, having found application of the Federal Bureau of Investigation for an order requiring the production of tangible things from Verizon—specifically Verizon Business Network Services, et cetera, et cetera—orders that the custodian of records produce—not to the FBI—but to the National Security Agency, a component of the Defense Department, upon service of this order, and continued production on an ongoing, daily basis thereafter for the duration of this order, unless otherwise ordered by the court, an electronic copy of the following tangible things:

□ 1350

Right here. Take a look at it.

These tangible things are identified in the order as follows:

All call detail records or telephony metadata created by Verizon for communications 1) between the United States and abroad—it sounds like it might be international—and then 2) wholly within the United States, including local telephone calls.

On its face, this is an order for Verizon—our largest cellular telephone company—to turn over call records for every single call in its possession. Mr. Chairman, that includes calls by you, it also includes calls by me. In fact, it includes calls by me when I call my mother or my wife or my daughter. For those who are listening on C–SPAN or otherwise, it includes every call by you.

Now, the first question that comes to mind is: Is this just for Verizon? Well, we don't know for sure, at this point, but the NSA has not denied that there are orders similar in extent for MCI, for AT&T, for Sprint, for every telephone company that carries any significant amount of data or calls in this country.

Another question is: How far back does this order go? The order itself is dated on its face April 25, 2013. One of the more interesting things about this order, posted on the Guardian's Web site, is that it has no starting date. Under this order—under the plain terms of this order—Verizon has to go and give the Federal Government—specifically the Department of Defense, the NSA—all of its call records of all of its calls going back to the beginning of time. And this obligation continues until July 19, 2013, presumably because the order will be renewed at that point upon request of the NSA and the FBI.

Let's be clear about this. This appears to be an order providing that our telephone companies providing service to us turn over call records for every single telephone call, regardless of whether it's international or not.

Now, if somebody had come to me 9 days ago and said to me, Congressman GRAYSON, do you think that the Defense Department is taking records of every telephone call that you make or I make or anyone else makes, I would say, no, I have no reason to believe that. It would shock me if it was true.

Well, it is true and it does shock me. Why should we have our personal telephone records, the records of whom we call, when we speak to them, how long we are talking, why should we have that turned over to the Defense Department? What possible rationale could there be for that?

Well, I'll tell you what I think the rationale might be: because somehow that makes us safer. Well, let me say to the NSA and to the Defense Department, you can rest assured there is no threat to America when I talk to my mother.

Now, what exactly is wrong with this? What's wrong with this, first of all, is that there is a firewall between the Defense Department and the CIA on the one hand, and the FBI and the Department of Justice on the other. One protects us from international threats, the other one protects us from domestic threats. That's been the law in America since the 1870s when Congress enacted and the President signed the Posse Comitatus Act. And this order crushes that distinction. It eliminates it, it obliterates it, it kills it now and forever.

Now, the second thing that is offensive about this court order is that it clearly violates the Fourth Amendment. The Fourth Amendment reads as follows:

> The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue but upon probable cause supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

Now, first of all, when the government seizes your phone records, unless you happen to be Osama Bin Laden or someone close to him, there is no reason why the government would believe or have reason to believe probable cause that you've committed a crime or you're going to commit a crime or you have any evidence about someone committing a crime. There's no probable cause here.

Secondly, the Fourth Amendment requires particularity. There's no particularity when the government insists by court order and under threat of further action that Verizon or AT&T or Sprint or anyone else be required to turn over their phone records to the government. There's no particularity.

This really is the essence of the matter. Because if you ask the NSA for justification, they'll say: Well, it's legal. What do you mean it's legal?

Well, according to their published statements, including a statement by their Director last Saturday, they maintain that it's legal because of a single Supreme Court case decided in 1979 that said that the government, specifically local police authorities, could acquire the phone records of one person once. That's the case of Smith v. Maryland in 1979.

Because the Supreme Court says that, at that point, the government could acquire the phone records of one person once, the NSA is maintaining that its entire program is legal and that it can acquire the phone records of

everyone, everywhere, forever. That is a farce.

Now, the other document that came to light last Thursday—in other words, 8 days ago as I speak—was a document, again posted at the Guardian's and then later at the Washington Post's Web site. This is a document that is a PowerPoint presentation, which according to the reports was a PowerPoint presentation to analysts working for the NSA. This PowerPoint presentation is labeled ''PRISM/US–984XN Overview,'' or ''the SIGAD Used Most in NSA Reporting.''

What you see to my right is the reproduction of what was posted at the Web site a week ago. First of all, note that there are certain logos at the top of the page:

Gmail, which for those of you who are not familiar, is the largest provider of email services and hosting. It's run by Google.

Facebook. Many of us are familiar with that. I think my children are all too familiar with it and spend an awful lot of time on it. Facebook allows, among other things, private messaging between friends.

Hotmail, which is Microsoft's email server and service.

Yahoo, which performs a variety of functions, including, among other things, hosting a large number of Web pages. And by the way, when you go to their Web page they can tell who you are from your IP address. And also a very widely used email service.

Google. I think Google needs no introduction, but I've already introduced it. Google allows you to do web searches. It, together with Microsoft, has almost 90 percent of the Web search market in the United States. They keep a record of the searches that you make based upon your IP address.

Skype, which is a telephone company that transmits calls electronically over the Internet.

PalTalk. I'm puzzled. I don't know what that one is.

YouTube, which is the largest host of videos in the world, and again, can tell which videos you're looking at by your IP address.

And AOL Mail, which, as it sounds, is the America Online email service.

This document is dated at the bottom April of 2013, meaning last month—or maybe 2 months ago.

Let's take a look inside. One of the pages that's been produced on the Guardian and Washington Post Web site is this:

By way of background, it's been reported that this is part of a longer document. It's 41-pages long. Only 5 pages have been released to the public through the Guardian and through the Washington Post.

□ 1400

So I'm sharing with you the five pages that were released a week ago and are now public. Let's take a look at this one. This one says that the NSA's PRISM program performs the following functions—and bear in mind, this is purported to be a training document given to NSA analysts to explain what they can do in this program.

Who are the current providers to the program?

Microsoft's Hotmail, et cetera, Google, Yahoo!, Facebook, Paltalk, YouTube, Skype, AOL, and Apple.

What are they providing? Specifically, as the document says, What will you—meaning the analyst—receive in collection, collection from surveillance and stored communications?

The document says it varies by provider. We don't know how it varies, but, in general, what you get is the following: email. The NSA gets email from these providers. It gets Video and Voice Chat, videos, photos, stored data, VoIP, which is an electronic version of your actual words when you are speaking on the phone. VoIP stands for ''Voice over Internet Protocol.'' It's your voice. It gets file transfers, video conferencing, notification of target activity, including log-ons—in other words, are you on your computer or not?—et cetera, online social network details, and what is beliedly referred to as ''special requests,'' as if all of that weren't enough already.

You might wonder: How does the government actually get this information? The five pages that are released give us one answer to that question. Let's take a look at that.

If you look at the bottom, the green rectangle, you'll see that it says that PRISM collection is directly from the servers of these U.S. service providers: Microsoft, Yahoo!, Google, Facebook, Paltalk, AOL, Skype, YouTube, and Apple.

Since it's addressed to the trainees at the NSA, to the people who will actually be doing the analysis of this data—and with the injunction on the left which says you should do both—the plain meaning of this is that the NSA apparently has the capability to collect directly from the servers of these service providers the information on the previous page—in other words, our emails, our chats, our videos, our photos, our stored data, our Voice over Internet Protocol, our file transfers, our video conferencing, our log-ins, et cetera, et cetera.

Now, there is an interesting distinction between these two documents:

In the first case, with regard to the court order, the NSA's position is that it's a valid court order, and we regard it as legal. If you don't like it, that's too bad with you. Go change the law—to which I say, fine, I'm going to try to change that law.

With regard to the second document, the situation is a little more ambiguous. What the NSA has said publicly is that the green rectangle is actually not correct. Now, bear in mind, no one has said that this is not an NSA document. No one has said that it's Photoshopped. No one has said that it is anything other than what it purports to be and what it was reported as.

However, the NSA has taken the position that their own document is wrong for reasons that we don't know and that the NSA, in fact, does not have the capability to directly take-collect from the servers of these companies your emails, your Voice over Internet Protocol, your photos, and everything else. They say that they just don't do that. However, we are still waiting for an explanation of how this green rectangle ended up in this document. If it's not true, they need to explain how and why it's not true.

The NSA also says that, for reasons not evident from this document at all, they don't do this for U.S. citizens. Now, that raises a host of questions. You might think that there might be something else in this document that says that, but the NSA hasn't maintained that. In other words, they haven't said, If you look somewhere else in this document, you'll find that we don't do this for U.S. citizens.

Unless you think that this is somehow selective on my part or on anybody else's part, it has been reported that the whistleblower provided this entire document—all, apparently, 41 pages—to The Guardian and to The Washington Post, and they decided on their own to release only these five.

So if there is something that indicates that the NSA is only doing this for Americans, apparently it's not in this document, and we've reached a strange point where people are being trained in the NSA to have the ability to get the emails and the other information on Americans, but somehow we are told later, separately, that that's not correct. In addition to that, the NSA says that there is some process by which they can distinguish between the emails of Americans and the emails of foreigners.

Frankly, that is a technology so advanced to me that it seems like it might be magic. I used to be the president of a telephone company. I have literally no idea how I could distinguish between the email accounts of an American and a foreigner. I don't know how to do it. Maybe they can tell us how they do it if they're doing it at all. That's the real question: if they're doing it at all. I don't know how they could possibly say this email account is for a foreigner, and this email account is for an American. If they can't, that means they're taking all this stuff—American and foreign—and having it, using it, looking at it, and destroying our privacy rights.

That really is the heart of the matter here.

I don't understand why anyone would think that it's somehow okay for the Department of Defense to get every single one of our call records regardless of who we are, regardless of whether we are innocent or guilty of anything. I venture to say that there are Americans who have never even had a parking ticket; yet the Defense Department is pulling their call records as well. Eventually, we will find out whether

the NSA's own document is misleading and whether the NSA is not pulling email accounts and emails and photos and VoIP calls on people who are Americans, because, if you read this document, it sure looks like they are.

This is not the first time that we have had this problem. This is not the first time that the government has entered into surveillance on people without probable cause. Many of us remember that there was FBI surveillance of Martin Luther King, including the wiretapping and bugging of his personal conversations. I thought, perhaps naively, that we had moved beyond that. In some sense, we have moved beyond that because now they're doing it to everyone. In fact, one could well say that we are reaching the point at which Uncle Sam is Big Brother.

I submit to you that this program, although the proponents picked it as American as ''apple spy,'' is an anti-American program. We are not North Koreans. We don't live in Nazi Germany. We are Americans and we are human beings, and we deserve to have our privacy respected. I have no way to call my mother except to employ the services of Verizon or AT&T or some other telephone company. I'm not going to string two cups between my house and her house 70 miles away. That doesn't mean that it's okay with me for the government—and specifically the Department of Defense—to be getting information about every telephone call I make to her. It's not okay with me.

I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, it's probably not okay with you, and I know that, for most of the people who are listening to me today, it's not okay with you either.

□ 1410

Then Franklin said:

Those who would give up essential liberty to purchase a little temporary safety, deserve neither liberty nor safety.

I agree with that. We do not have to give up our liberty to be safe.

I have already heard from people who tell me that they're afraid that they're going to be blown up by some terrorist somewhere, that they're afraid their personal safety is at risk, and it's okay with them if the government spies on them.

Well, it's not okay with me. And I stand here on behalf of the millions of Americans who are wanting to say, It's not okay with me either. I'm fed up, and I'm not going to take it any more.

When we had the Civil War and there were 1 million armed men in this country who rose up heavily armed to fight against our central government, we did not establish a spy network in every city, every town, every village, every home; but that's what we've done right now.

When I was growing up and we had 10,000 nuclear warheads pointed at us and some people believed there was a Communist under every bed, even then we did not establish a spy network as intrusive as this one.

I submit to you that this has gone way too far and that it's up to us to tell the Defense Department, the NSA, the so-called ''intelligence establishment,'' we've had enough. We are human beings. We are a free people. And based upon this evidence, we're going to have to work to keep it that way. That's what I'll be doing. I hope you'll join me.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the privilege of addressing you here on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives and to have an opportunity to inject some dialogue into the ears and minds of this body and across the country as people observe the deliberations here in the House.

I came to the floor, Mr. Speaker, to address the issue of immigration again. As we're watching the acceleration of an immigration proposal that's coming through, moving in this direction at a minimum from the United States Senate, it's important for us, Mr. Speaker, to recognize that there are a series and set of beliefs over there that don't necessarily conform with the majority here in the House of Representatives.

If you look at the names and the reputations and the faces of the people that are advocating for ''comprehensive immigration reform,'' and you recognize the history of some of them—regretfully, Senator Teddy Kennedy is not here to advocate, but he's one of the original proponents of what I call ''comprehensive amnesty.'' He was one of the voices in 1986. In fact, he was one of the voices back in the sixties on comprehensive immigration reform. Ronald Reagan signed the Amnesty Act of 1986. We do have some people around here of significant credibility that were part of that process back then, Mr. Speaker. One of those is Attorney General Ed Meese.

Attorney General Meese was there as a counselor and adviser to the President. He read the 1986 Amnesty Act, of course, and he had full access to President Reagan. All of his Cabinet members—a good number of them—weighed in with President Reagan. I remember where I was. I was running my construction company back in 1986 during the middle of the farm crisis.

I remember being in my office when I had been watching the debate and reading the news and seeing what was moving through the United States Congress and all the while believing that if you waive the application of the law to people who have willfully broken the laws, it is a reward for those lawbreakers to waive it; and if you reward them with the objective of their crime, as the 1986 Amnesty Act did, then the result of that is not what was promised.

What was promised was we will now enforce immigration law forever, and there will never be another amnesty act. That was the promise. The enforcement was that we had to file I–9 forms for every job applicant which would put the pertinent data of the job applicant down on the I–9 form, and we dotted all the Is and we crossed all the Ts on the I–9 form, and we looked at the identification documents of the applicants that were applying to come to work at my construction company and thousands of companies across America.

We had, Mr. Speaker, the full expectation that the Immigration Naturalization Services—then INS and now ICE—would be coming and knocking on our door and going through our records to make sure that we did everything exactly right because the force of enforcement was what was going to justify the amnesty that was granted in the 1986 Amnesty Act.

We were going to enforce and control our border and our ports of entry and enforce the law against those who were unlawfully working in the United States. In exchange for that, there was going to be the legalization of some first 700,000 to 800,000 people in the United States that were here illegally. It was adjusted up to be 1 million people that turned out to be 3 million people. The lowest number on the 1986 Amnesty Act turned out to be 2.7 million to 2.8 million; the highest number is someplace around 3.5 million or 6 million.

But in the neighborhood of 3 million people took advantage of the 1986 Amnesty Act. That's triple, by anybody's number, the original estimate. The tradeoff again was in order to get an agreement with the Senator Teddy Kennedy-types that were in the United States Senate and House at the time, there had to be a concession made.

From where I come from, Mr. Speaker, it's really pretty easy. The rule of law is the rule of law. The Constitution is the supreme law of the land. Legislating is the exclusive province of article I within this Constitution, the legislative branch of government, the United States Congress, the House and the Senate on opposite sides of the rotunda coming to a conclusion and we concur, pass a conference report that goes to the President. When the President signs that, it becomes law, and that's the law that we abide by. It's not complicated to understand. That's what they teach in eighth grade civics class. But the expectation that the law would be enforced and the real effort on the part of President Reagan to do so was eroded by people that undermined that effort.

Many of them never intended to follow through on the law enforcement side of the bargain. Not only the border security, but also the workplace jobs enforcement side, the legislation that some was formed then, some came along in 1996, that required that the immigration enforcement officers,

when they encountered someone that was unlawfully in the United States, that they're required by law to place them into removable proceedings. That's the law.

Ronald Reagan was an honorable man. I had great faith in the principles that he so clearly articulated to the entire Nation and the world with utter confidence. When I saw that amnesty legislation pass out of the House and the Senate back in 1986, I had so much confidence in the clarity of the vision and understanding of Ronald Reagan, that I was confident that he would veto the misguided Amnesty Act of 1986 because you can't trade off amnesty for a promise that there would be law enforcement or border security. The first thing you do is enforce the law. You establish that the law is enforced.

What would happen if there had been 700,000 or 800,000 people in the United States then who were living in the shadows, and what if we would have enforced the border at the time, if we had enforced immigration law at the time, and if we didn't force the shut-off-the-jobs magnet at that time? Then that number that was viewed to be an intolerably high number in 1986, that 700,000 to 800,000, would have become instead a number that would have been less than that and not more than that.

If you would have enforced the law in 1986, there would have been fewer people unlawfully in the United States and not more. But, instead, as time went on—by the way, neither Ronald Reagan nor his successor, George H.W. Bush, saw a particular political bump for signing the Amnesty Act or for supporting it. Regardless, as time went on, there was less and less respect for the law because there was less and less enforcement of the law.

As much as Ronald Reagan would have liked to enforce the law, he didn't have everybody bought in on that, Mr. Speaker. So as the undermining of the enforcement and the turning of the blind eye took place, there was less and less respect for the rule of law and employers themselves began to understand that INS is not going to be in your work place; they're not going to go through your HR records; and they're not going to apply sanctions against employers for hiring people that are unlawfully present in the United States and can't legally work in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the respect for the law was diminished because there was less enforcement of the law in the workplace on the border, and then we began to see the advocates for open borders start to emerge.

□ 1420

I want to compliment former chairman of the Judiciary Committee, LAMAR SMITH, for the stellar work that he has done in the immigration reform legislation that he was a central figure of when he was chairman of the Immigration Subcommittee back in 1996. I look back at the language that was put in place then and I'm continually thankful, because this nation has been rewarded by the vision of now-Congressman LAMAR SMITH, and it has made our jobs easier here.

But also the 1996 immigration reform, which was enforcement reform, was triggered off of, to some degree, Barbara Jordan's study that took place in around 1991, if I remember correctly, that if you grant amnesty, you'll get more people coming in here illegally. And the principles are this: you enforce the law. You have to place people in removal proceedings if they violate the law. It is not a draconian thing to do. If you put someone back in the condition they were in before they broke the law, that's not a particularly draconian punishment, and if that's hard to understand, Mr. Speaker—and I know you understand all things—but think of it this way: If someone goes in and robs a bank and they step out on the steps of the bank with the sack of loot, and law enforcement appears and says, sorry, you can't keep the loot, we're going to put that back in the bank, but you can go. That's the equivalent of removal. You don't get to keep the objective of the crime. We put you back in the condition that you were in before you committed the crime. That's not draconian. That's the minimum you can do and still have a rule of law apply. You can't be a nation if you don't have borders. And if you don't determine as a nation what crosses those borders, people, or goods, contraband or not, if you don't make those decisions as a government, as a people, then it's out of control. Then you're really not a nation. Then immigration policy is set by the people that decide they're going to break your laws and come across that border, and if we decide we're not going to enforce those laws, we have, as is often advertised by people in both bodies this year, not so much last year—this year—de facto amnesty.

De facto amnesty. That means the equivalent of amnesty in Latin. But they also argue we have to do something to resolve the circumstances of ending this de facto amnesty because it's an unjust condition to have people in.

Now, I don't feel that same injustice, Mr. Speaker, because, first of all, the people that are here living under the described de facto amnesty made the decision to come here and live in the shadows. And some will say, well, they didn't if they were a child when they were brought by their parents, and that's true to a degree, and the group of people that we are the most sympathetic to are those DREAMers, those kids that were brought here when they were young, that have gone through our educational system—paid for by U.S. taxpayers, by the way—that may have a significant opportunity in this country but are subject to removal just like their parents, who clearly knew they were breaking the law.

Some of those people have been boldly lobbying across these Capitol grounds, and there was a circumstance not that long ago where the president of the ICE union, Chris Crane, who is the lead plaintiff in the lawsuit of Crane v. Napolitano that seeks to correct the unconstitutional actions of the executive branch, including the President, but Chris Crane was testifying before a Senate Judiciary Committee on immigration, and while that was going on, they had people that were illegal aliens in the United States, unlawfully present in the United States—by the way, that's a legal term, illegal alien—but they were in the room, in the Senate Judiciary Committee, while the president of the ICE union is testifying. They were also in the hallway outside the Judiciary Committee as recently as yesterday, and they had been invited into the Judiciary Committee, or at least recognized and introduced inside the House Judiciary Committee by former chairman, now ranking member, JOHN CONYERS of Michigan.

How far have we come, Mr. Speaker, when we have people who are subject at the specific directive of the law that, when encountered by the law enforcement officers, they are required by law to place them in removal proceedings, and now they come into the United States Capitol and insist that we change the law to accommodate lawbreakers. If we do that, whatever our hearts say about the DREAMers, whatever the short-term piece is about that small segment of the larger group of people that's defined as 11 million, and probably is two or more times greater than that, whatever our heart says about that, we're eroding the rule of law if we grant a component of amnesty.

Our rule of law is more sacred to us than the sympathy that we turn towards people that maybe didn't make this decision themselves. But I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the President has directed and it is in the letter of the executive memos that have been produced by John Morton, the head of ICE, and supported by Janet Napolitano, who is the Secretary of Homeland Security, who is the subject of the lawsuit led by Chris Crane, the president of ICE, naming Janet Napolitano and has been before the court in the Northern District of Texas and received roughly a 90 percent decision at this point from Judge Reed O'Connor that when Congress says ''shall,'' it doesn't mean ''may.'' In other words, if you're for open borders, Mr. President, the law says thou shalt not read the law to mean you may enforce the law; it says you shall enforce the law.

The President of the United States takes an oath of office, and it's prescribed in the Constitution. And part of the language that he adheres to is to take care that the laws be faithfully executed. That means enforced. It doesn't mean kill the law, Mr. Speaker. It doesn't mean tear the Constitution up and throw it out the window. It means take care the laws be faithfully

executed. In other words, enforce the law.

The President has defied his own oath of office, and he has prohibited the ICE and other law enforcement officers from enforcing the clear letter of the law, and some of that was law that was put in place in 1996 under the pen of LAMAR SMITH, who was the lead sponsor on the immigration reform legislation of that time.

The President gave a speech to a high school just out here in Washington, D.C., on March 28—I believe the date was March 28, 2011; I know the actual date of the month, not necessarily the year—and he said to them, I know you want me to establish the DREAM Act by Executive order. In other words, legalize people who were brought here by their parents under the age of 16 and essentially give them a work permit and perhaps a path to citizenship. But he said, I can't do that. It's not my constitutional authority to waive the law and grant, I'll say, executive amnesty to the DREAMers. Instead, he said, you understand—he said to the students—you understand the Constitution, you've been taught and you learned this, that there are three branches of government. The legislature has to pass the laws, that's Congress, and the President's job is to enforce the laws. That's the President who was speaking before that group on March 28, and the judicial branch is to interpret the laws.

Well, that's a pretty nice, tight, composite summary of the structure of our Constitution and our Federal Government. And it is worthy of a former adjunct law professor who taught constitutional law at the University of Chicago, President Barack Obama. He understood it clearly. He articulated it clearly to the young people there at the high school just outside here in D.C. And March 28, a little over a year later, the President decided that he was no longer going to respect his own word, his own oath of office or his own interpretation of the Constitution and just, I'll say it wasn't necessarily an executive whim—I suspect it was more like a political calculation. He did a press conference 2 hours after Janet Napolitano released the memo that created four classes of people who were exempted from the law and gave them a work permit.

By the way, all lawful presence here in the United States either comes from birth, natural born citizen, or the naturalization process that's set up by Congress, or the visas, visitors visas, student visas, H–1Bs, H–2Bs, ag workers, all of the lawful presence in the United States aside from natural born citizens is a product of the United States Congress.

Many believe, and I almost entirely agree, that the Constitution defines immigration as the exclusive province of Congress. It clearly defines the legislative activity as the exclusive province of the United States Congress, article I in the Constitution.

And so when the President decides he's going to create immigration law, waive the application of the law and create new law out of thin air, and when Janet Napolitano releases the Morton memo and announces that here are these four classes of people now exempt from the law and manufactures a work permit out of thin air, that happened, and 2 hours later the President was doing a press conference repeating the same thing at the White House.

□ 1430

And so it's not that the President happened to say those things in a press conference. It's not that Janet Napolitano happened to pick the timing of 2 hours before the President's press conference. Of course this was coordinated, and I'd asked her that under oath before the committee, if it was coordinated. The essential answer, after the typical, long rambling that you get from those kind of witnesses was yes.

And so one can only conclude that either it was by the order of the President or the consent of the President that the Constitution itself, I believe, was violated. I believe that the separation of powers was violated. And it appears to me, from reading Judge Reed O'Connor's decision in the case of Crane v. Napolitano, he agrees also, and wrote repeatedly, ''shall'' means ''shall''; it doesn't mean ''may.'' When the law says ''shall be enforced,'' ''shall be placed'' into removal proceedings, it means exactly that.

And so I expect that we will see a final decision out of the Northern District of Texas. Roughly 90 percent of the arguments that we made before the Court were agreed to by Judge Reed O'Connor, and the other one was one that the executive branch's argument was, let's see, less intelligible than it needed to be before a definitive decision could be rendered by a prudent Judge Reed O'Connor. And we'll see that decision perhaps come down very soon.

And I expect that this administration will litigate this all the way to the Supreme Court and insist that the President can legislate by executive order or executive edict, that they can provide executive amnesty.

If the President can suspend any law, if he has the authority to suspend any law and he has the authority to manufacture any law out of thin air—and out of thin air was the work permit, just as a reminder. Made up a work permit so that the DREAMers that he had exempted from the law could legally—and it's really questionable about the legally part—work in the United States.

If the President can manufacture law out of thin air, and if the President can order that the law be suspended, and if the president of ICE can be sitting in a room with people that are unlawfully present in the United States and compelled by law to place them in removal proceedings but prohibited by order of the President or his executive minions, we have come to a very bad place in America, Mr. Speaker.

Our Constitution itself is threatened. The function of the three branches of the government has been so blurred by an Executive that has contempt for his own oath and contempt for the Constitution itself and the separation of powers. And each time that we go to the Court to get an answer, we're asking the third branch of government to be the referee between the two competing branches, the executive and the legislative branch.

And the Founding Fathers, as they set up this magnificent and brilliant and balanced Constitution between the three branches of government, they envisioned this: each branch of government would have its own constitutional power, and that power was something that wasn't precisely defined between the three branches of government.

They expected the judicial branch would be the weakest of the three branches of government. Some years it is; some years it's not. But they also expected that the executive branch, the President, and the legislative branch, Congress, would reach a level of tension between the two where each branch would jealously guard the constitutional authority that's vested within it and the supreme law of the land, the Constitution. And instead, it seems as though these Members of Congress, 435 here and 100 Senators over on the other side, even though we all take an oath to uphold the Constitution of the United States, seem to have a different understanding of what this Constitution really is. And they seem to have a blurred and weak understanding of the legislative authority that we have here.

Our Founding Fathers envisioned that. They put all of the power of the purse right here in the House of Representatives. Spending bills start here. There can't be a dollar spent by this government unless the House of Representatives approves it, whether we start it here and the Senate amends it and it comes back, or whether we start it here and the Senate approves it and it goes to the President's desk. There can't be money spent unless this House approves it.

And so we have the power of the purse. And they expected we would use the power of the purse in order to restrain an out-of-control Executive. They set some other structures in place, too, that none of us want to contemplate having to use the more draconian approach to this. But the President of the United States has defied the authority here of Congress and his own oath of office, and this Congress has not gotten its back up nearly enough to defend the constitutional authority that we have, or the affront to it.

And so, in an appropriations bill last week, I offered an amendment, an amendment that would prohibit any of the funds from being used to carry out

the orders that came from John Morton and Janet Napolitano and approved by President Obama that grant this executive amnesty to the four classes of people. This is a whole series of six memos, known as the Morton memos. And no money can be used to enforce or implement or execute the special work permit created either by those memos. And that amendment was debated here on the floor, vigorously, I might add, very late at night, and I made a strong constitutional argument, I believe. Members of Congress came down here to the floor of the House, and they voted by a vote of 224–201 to support my amendment.

This Congress has spoken. We may disagree on what we do with people that are unlawfully here, but the majority of the House of Representatives, that 224 vote clearly said we are going to defend our constitutional authority to legislate. We're not going to allow the President to make it up as he goes along, and we're going to constrain the purse strings of a President that would legislate by executive edict, which, in this case, is executive amnesty.

So that's a move in the right direction, Mr. Speaker. But as I see the things unfolding in the United States Senate and the language that comes out of there and the argument that has been repeatedly made here on the floor of the House and, to some extent, in the Senate, we have de facto amnesty. De facto amnesty is a reality because the President, as I said, broke his own oath of office.

We've gone to court to do all we can do there, and that's moving through the system. But there's another way that this is happening, and that is this. In the minds of too many Members of Congress, they believe that we have to conform our legislation to the President's will. Because the President has refused to enforce the law, they argue that we should conform the law to something the President will enforce.

That's way outside my ability to reason within the confines of the Constitution, Mr. Speaker. I can think of a time or two—and there have been more, I'm sure—that the Supreme Court ruled and they came down with a ruling that this Congress agreed was a constitutional interpretation.

The partial birth abortion legislation was one of those. Congress passed a ban on partial birth abortion. The ruling that came out of the Supreme Court was that the language that banned partial birth abortion was too vague and there wasn't a provision in it that made an exception for the life or health of the mother.

So Congress went back to work. We rolled up our sleeves. I was there in those discussions and in the debate and helped move it forward. STEVE CHABOT of Ohio was the principal sponsor of that legislation. It defined the act precisely from a medical perspective of partial birth abortion. We brought in experts that testified over and over again, and we brightened the definition, and a brighter, brighter line on what that was. And the Congressional findings, after much medical deliberation, was that a partial birth abortion is never necessary to save the life of the mother, that it just doesn't occur from a medical perspective.

Yes, there are those dissenters out there, Mr. Speaker. I don't bring this up for that reason. Congress read the Supreme Court decision and conformed our legislation to the decision that was a precedent decision of the United States Supreme Court. That shows a decent respect for the jurisprudence of the judicial branch of government, and it's appropriate for this Congress to respect the judgment of the other branches of government.

But we all take an oath to uphold the Constitution. We're not bound by someone else's judgment of what that oath means or what the Constitution means. We're bound by a clear understanding of the Constitution itself, the text of the Constitution, the original text, plus the amendments.

The Constitution has to mean what it says. It has to mean what it says on its face. That's what words are there for. It has to also mean what it was understood to mean at the time of ratification, or there's no guarantee.

□ 1440

This Constitution, Mr. Speaker, is a contractual guarantee that we received, starting in 1789, amended 27 times since then. Every single amendment in there, all the language in there, has to mean what it was understood to mean at the moment of ratification. It can't be changed in its definition because it's inconvenient for today or our Founding Fathers would have not given us a means to amend this Constitution. It has to mean what it was understood to mean, and you can't change its definition. Because if you do so, you're breaking an intergenerational contract that was handed to us in 1789 to be preserved, protected and defended, this Constitution.

So each Member of Congress needs to understand that, take an oath to uphold this Constitution—we do that—defend it. But when the reasonable jurisprudence of a constitutional analysis comes from the Supreme Court, we conform to that. In the case of partial-birth abortion, we've conformed in a number of other times, and that's a respectful thing to do from one branch of government to the other.

But when the President of the United States defies the literal language in the law and orders that there be no application of the law because he disagrees with the law and manufactures a work permit out of thin air, and when a Congress accepts the President's idea on that and decides that we are going to pass legislation—as has been offered by the Gang of Eight in the Senate and the Gang of Eight, minus one, now seven in the House—that we're going to conform this Congress to the whim of the President—not that we agree with his policy, but they say, well, you'll never get enforcement of the law unless you conform the law to what the President's willing to do. My gosh.

What would the Founding Fathers say if the Chief Executive Officer of the United States and our Commander in Chief defies his own oath of office by his own definition—at the school, March 28, as I said; refuses to enforce the law, pledges to punish even the president of the Immigration and Customs Enforcement union for doing what he's commanded by law to do. The President does that, and there's any kind of mindset here in Congress that we should conform the law to the President's whim. No, Mr. Speaker.

The President has this alternative: if he disagrees with the law of the land and he wants to see it changed, then he can ask people in this Congress, the House and Senate—House or the Senate, for that matter—would you kindly draft some legislation that would please me and I'll be supportive of it as you try to work it through the legislative process—through regular order, as our Speaker often says. That's the President's alternative.

He doesn't write law. He does have the opportunity to veto laws that he disagrees with that reach his desk. But, technically, the President can't even introduce a piece of legislation here in the House or the Senate. But we know that there are friends of the President that are willing to do that, and it should be so, so that the President can advocate for legislation and ask people to move it through the system.

But instead, as I said, he's defied his oath. He has challenged this Congress. And some Republicans and most Democrats appear to have this spell cast upon them that suspends their otherwise good judgment and they're working down the path of a comprehensive amnesty plan in the Senate—and the stage is set here in the House where I can surely see something similar emerging here.

We need to stand up and argue. There's a future for this country. There's a destiny for this country. It is a precious thing that we hold in our hands here, the destiny of the United States of America. The pillars of American exceptionalism built this.

You can open this Constitution up and go to article I, II and III, the legislative, the executive and the judicial branches of government—in priority order, I would say, because article I reflects more directly the voice of the people, the legislature, the Congress.

If there is a conflict between the three branches of government, how is it resolved, Mr. Speaker? If you dig deeply into this and you look at our history and you watch how things have reacted, sometimes the judicial branch comes out on top, sometimes the executive branch comes out on top, sometimes the legislative branch comes out on top. But if push comes to shove, it's the people, we the people, that come out on top.

That's why the House of Representatives has elections every 2 years, so we can be the quick reaction force. When people get their back up and they don't like the direction their government is going, they recruit people, they step up, they run for office. And 2 years later—2 years, or less, later—there's an election, and often new people come into the House of Representatives that more acutely reflect the values and the wishes of those who elected them.

We saw that happen in 2010. The year 2009–2010 brought us ObamaCare. We saw tens of thousands of people all around this Capitol. We saw not just a human chain, not just a human ring, but a human doughnut formed around the United States Capitol; people six and eight deep, human contact all the way around the United States Capitol. I went up to look at it, and I walked around to look at it. If we could have—of course for air space, helicopters can't go up and take pictures. There's no way to get that shot. I wish I had gone up with a camera up on top and done a panoramic, interconnectable picture so that people could see the magnificent unity of the American people, hand to hand, six to eight deep, that thick, a human doughnut all the way around the Capitol saying: keep your hands off our health care. Keep your hands off our health insurance.

That protest was defied when the then-Speaker, NANCY PELOSI, walked through the throng with her huge magnum gavel—you'll remember that, Mr. Speaker, about that long—in a show and display of—what shall I call it—regality. The regal Speaker was coming through with her big gavel to rule over the American people who said: keep your hands off our health care.

To this day, I don't know of a single legitimate poll that says that they want ObamaCare over repeal of ObamaCare. The last number I saw was 56 percent of the American people want to see ObamaCare repealed. They came here to this city and they said: keep your hands off our health care—tens of thousands. They came on three different occasions that I recall: on November 5, and then later in March, about March 22 or so, a Thursday, and then again on a Saturday. Some of them flew up here to be here on a Thursday, flew back home and got the call to come back again. They didn't leave the airport; they just went to the ticket counter and came back. They care that much about our freedom. And still, ObamaCare is being imposed upon them.

They went to the polls in the fall of 2010. They elected 87 new freshman Republicans to come serve here in the House of Representatives. And they every single one of them ran on the ticket of repealing ObamaCare, every single one—87 new freshmen. A magnificent turnover. A class that I call God's gift to America.

Now, that class of 87 is here—most of them still here—and a new class has been elected. All of the freshmen that came in on my side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, and all of those that came in in 2010 and every Republican in the House of Representatives has voted to repeal ObamaCare. I believe up until, I'll say, last fall's election—I'm not certain what's happened in the Senate, but up until that time every Republican Senator has voted to repeal ObamaCare. They all took that pledge. That's an example of the quick reaction force of the people.

Now, it didn't work out so well with the Presidential election. But I can tell you that if that election result had been different for the Presidency, the ObamaCare repeal bill and getting past, I'll say, a new majority in the United States Senate, it would have gone to a new President's desk.

But it was passed out of this House of Representatives. I drafted the 40-word repeal language in the middle of the night after the ObamaCare legislation was passed. I wasn't alone doing that; I had company doing that. But the response of the American people overcomes the division between the lines of the three branches of government.

It's the people who will speak. When people rise up, when they elect new people to the United States Congress, when their voice is heard in the ballot box electing a President, then even a Supreme Court decision can be reversed by the voice of the people. It may take a constitutional amendment; but in the end, power is something that you can assume.

Anyone can assume power. We do that in our own families when we direct our children to stay out of the cookie jar, for example. As long as they respect that power, you have that power, Mr. Speaker. But if it's challenged and defied, then the power disappears, and it goes to whatever entity can claim that power, whatever entity can successfully assert that power.

So we're in the struggle right now. The President's hand is in the article I legislative cookie jar. He's reached in and said: I'm taking these cookies of immigration because I don't like the law that exists; I refuse to enforce the law; and I'm going to make up a new law while we're at it.

□ 1450

It's almost like having a child with his hand in the cookie jar with that defiant look in his eye thinking, ''And you can't do anything about it. You can go to the judicial branch and you can litigate.''

We've done that. The Court is one day going to come down with a decision. Will the President honor the decision of the Court? If it gets all the way to the Supreme Court, will he honor it or will he defy it?

I sat here on this floor, Mr. Speaker, as the President spoke from the rostrum right behind me lecturing the Supreme Court that sat over here and told them that their decision was wrong. That's not a decent respect for the opinions of mankind that are seated in the United States Supreme Court. That blurs the lines between the judicial and the executive branch of government. It also tells me that we have a President who doesn't understand his restraint.

But I'm troubled by a Congress that will allow that to happen and will allow that Presidential hand into the legislative cookie jar, because we take an oath to uphold the Constitution. It's our obligation to do that. That means we defend the constitutional authority that we've taken an oath to uphold. That's where we sit.

Now, we'll get to the policy side of this from an immigration perspective, Mr. Speaker. If you reward people who break the law, you get more lawbreakers. It's that simple of an equation. I knew that in 1986. I knew that as a businessman who was working through the farm crisis years of the 1980s to keep my company up and going and trying to get it and keep it profitable and raise my young children at the time.

I remember when Ronald Reagan signed the Amnesty Act. That was a big mistake. That was one of only two times that the great man whom I have great respect for, Ronald Reagan, let me down. It was only twice in 8 years, but it comes back to haunt us yet to this day.

Why did I know in 1986, not being a Member of Congress, being a guy that had only been in business 9 years at the time, that had three young sons that were roughly 10 and under and a wife at home that was also working, how did I know that that was a mistake? What was it within me? I didn't have the background that matched up with Attorney General Meese, for example, or the President of the United States. I'm outside of little Kiron, Iowa, 300 people at the time. I can't see a neighbor from my porch. But I knew that that was a mistake. I had no idea that this many years later I'd be standing on the floor of the United States Congress making this case.

It wasn't a matter of clairvoyance. It was a matter of what was justice. It was a matter of growing up in a law enforcement family and being steeped in reverence for the supreme law of the land, this Constitution, and understanding that if you don't like the law, you abide by it. But there's a means to change it whether you're the President of the United States or whether you're this young fellow that's trying to run a business and raise his family but have respect for the rule of law.

When you cross those lines, and especially when you do so from the Office of the White House, the President of the United States, it's the equivalent of taking a jackhammer to one of the beautiful marble pillars of American exceptionalism.

Now, to define what those pillars are, they're here. They're here in the Bill of Rights. The First Amendment is real easy:

Freedom of speech. That's a pillar of exceptionalism. Without it, we can't be

the great country we are. Freedom of religion, same answer. Without it, we can't be the same great country that we are. Freedom of speech, religion, the press, assembly, the right to keep and bear arms, and the property rights that used to exist in the Fifth Amendment before the Kelo decision that we sought to restore in the Judiciary Committee just a couple of days ago. No double jeopardy, trial by a jury of your peers, a speedy trial, no cruel unusual punishment. The rights that are not in the Constitution devolve to the States, respectively, or to the people.

Those are all pillars of exceptionalism.

Free enterprise capitalism is another one. Without free enterprise capitalism, we don't have this vigorous and robust economy that we have.

That's on the citizenship test, by the way. What is the economic system of the United States? Free enterprise capitalism.

How about the property rights that exist within intellectual property up until we amended some of the patent and trademark laws? The property rights to intellectual property is one of the big, big reasons why the United States has been so successful.

So I put this all together and add to that the fact that this country was settled by the values of Western civilization, with Judeo-Christianity included in a prominent form. All of that arrived here on this continent at the dawn of the industrial revolution and the concept of manifest destiny that settled this country from sea to shining sea.

I can look back and try to reverse-engineer America and think where did we make a turn that I could even on Monday morning quarterbacking rules make a recommendation we should have turned another direction. I can't reverse-engineer America and come up with a greater country than we are, except maybe I'd go back to 1986 and say, Ronald Reagan, if you'd just vetoed the Amnesty Act in 1986, I wouldn't be standing here right now. We wouldn't have a Senate that's seeking to stampede an Amnesty Act across the rotunda over to us. I wouldn't have this spell that seems to be cast over too many Republicans that somehow if we'd just pass an Amnesty Act everything is going to be all right in political viability, Republicans will be okay going into the future, end this spell that has suspended good judgment and reason and suspended their ability to listen to empirical data and weigh the policy.

The immigration issue cuts across all the components of constitutional conservatism. Anything that has to do with family, for example, with the rule of law, with the economy, with national defense and national security, almost every issue that we deal with in this Congress is touched somehow by immigration.

It is not a simple topic. It's not something where you just say, Well, I feel sorry for the DREAMers; therefore, I'm going to grant amnesty. I support amnesty, I get that off the table, and maybe the next Congress can deal with it.

It does not work like that, Mr. Speaker. This is an irrevocable and irreversible advocacy for amnesty. It's something that cannot be undone. ObamaCare, as bad as it is—and I've spent more than 3 years of my life fighting ObamaCare and working to defeat it before it became law and repeal it after it became law. That's a matter of clear public record. But, Mr. Speaker, if I have to accept this perpetual and retroactive amnesty that is offered by the Gang of 8, or what I expect to come from the Gang of 8 minus one here in the House, if I have to choose between perpetual and retroactive amnesty and ObamaCare, I'm going to accept the ObamaCare and defeat the perpetual and retroactive amnesty, because later on we can repeal ObamaCare. We can undo it. We can take it apart. We can roll it back, and we can put together a doctor-patient relationship and a real healthy health care system in the United States. We know what it looks like. We know what to do. We couldn't get it done because we didn't have the votes.

But you can undo ObamaCare, Mr. Speaker, but you cannot undo comprehensive amnesty, because once that genie is out of the bottle, there's no putting the genie back in the bottle. It becomes as amorphous as a puff of smoke. And if they don't have the political will to enforce the law now, why would they have the political will to enforce the law after amnesty would be granted?

They argue that they have all these tight provisions put into the bill, that there's border security in the bill and that we'll get tight borders from this point on. Now, when you read the legislation, there's no prospect of that. I would have to hide my face to say something like that and wink and cross my fingers behind my back with the other hand. They don't mean it. They don't believe it. They write it because it is just a vague, open, comprehensive placebo for those who want border security to give people something to hide behind.

If you say that Janet Napolitano has got this time to come up with a plan to secure the border, it doesn't mean secure the border and it doesn't mean implement the plan. It just says come up with a plan. And if we're not satisfied with that, then they appoint a border security commission whose job is to come up with a plan. And if that fails, then they go back to Janet Napolitano again.

This isn't that hard, Mr. Speaker. If you're serious about enforcing the border, you can do that. If you would give me Janet Napolitano's job and a President who doesn't tie my hands, I would take the resources that are committed now within the 50 miles of the southern border, the southwest border, and I would get you upwards of the 99th percentile of border security within 3 years—maybe sooner, but I think it would take a half a year to get all the administrative things jump-started.

I'm in the construction business. I know how to build a fence, a wall and a fence. I know what it costs to do that. I'm not proposing we go down. I wouldn't bid such a thing, but I could surely provide some advice. I have designed it already, a fence, a wall, and a fence with access roads going between so you have a road between the first fence number one, wall would be the second and fence above that yet. You could patrol both of those areas in between a fence, a wall, and a fence. Doing so, you could secure it.

It's good to have border patrol personnel. Boots on the ground are good. They do a noble job down there under nearly impossible conditions. I'm a big fan of the Border Patrol, and I'd like to think they know it when I go down there to visit.

□ 1500

But when you start expanding boots on the ground because you don't want to put infrastructure in place, it isn't very logical to me. I live out in the country in rural Iowa. I live on the corner of gravel roads that go a mile in each of four directions where I live. If Janet Napolitano came to me and said: ''I want you to secure that mile of road that goes from your house west, and I'm going to pay you $6 million this year to secure that road,'' if I thought I might lose the contract next year, maybe I would think, well, I'll hire myself some border patrol agents, and we'll do our best to catch some of those folks—we know we're not going to get more than about 25 percent enforcement, but it's a job, and take it on.

But if I had a 10-year contract, it's not any longer $6 million a mile, it's $60 million a mile in a 10-year contract. If that contract was tied to efficiency, in other words if they would dock my pay if I didn't enforce the law, if I couldn't secure the border, I can tell you what I would do, Mr. Speaker. I would invest about $2 million a mile to build a fence, a wall, and a fence.

Now, $2 million is more than I think it takes. And to put this into perspective for people that might be overhearing our conversation, Mr. Speaker, we can build a four-lane interstate highway across expensive Iowa cornfields for right at $4 million a mile—buy the land, do the engineering, the archeological and environmental surveys, do the grading, pave it, shoulder it, paint the lines, put the fencing in, seed it, have it done and finished, and signs, for $4 million a mile.

Well, it's easy to see now that if we can do a four-lane interstate highway for $4 million, we can build a pretty tremendous fence for a couple of million dollars—a fence, a wall, and a fence—with just simply patrol roads that allow a person good-weather access through that desert part of the country.

It isn't hard to figure that out. If you give me $60 million for a mile, I would put a couple million dollars in a fence, a wall, and a fence, I would have myself the necessary border patrol agents to watch that, I would put some cameras up to surveil it, I would put some vibration sensors in, I would put some kind of technology on there to add to that—that they don't like me to talk about here on the floor of the House—and we would have ourselves a 99-plus percent secure border.

Had we done that back when the Secure Fence Act was passed here in the House—supported by DUNCAN HUNTER from California as the lead author and an excellent leader on this issue—had we done that, we wouldn't be having this discussion today, Mr. Speaker, because the southwest border would have been secure, and then that argument would be taken away.

Then when they promise that there will be border security, we would already have it. If we already had border security, then some of the harder hearts here in Congress could take a look at the 11 million that are here and think: Okay, we've demonstrated that we are going to enforce the law from this place forward; is there an accommodation that we can make?

We can't get to that decision because the President refuses to enforce the law, they won't allow that kind of security on the southern border—for political reasons, I believe—the ports of entry are not as tight as they need be, we don't have an entry-exit system; piece after piece of this that is necessary for security.

By the way, I have a bill called the New Idea Act. What it does is it clarifies that wages and benefits paid to illegals by employers are not tax deductible. It subjects that employer to an IRS audit. It gives the employer safe harbor if they use E-Verify, so that an employer could put the employees' numbers into the E-Verify database.

If it came back and said it confirms that these folks can work legally in the United States, put them to work without any kind of sanction or punishment for the employment—safe harbor.

But if the IRS comes in during a normal audit—doesn't accelerate the audits, but a normal audit—they would normally then—in the audit under my bill—they would put the Social Security numbers and the identifying information into E-Verify, run those employees through, and if it came back that they could not lawfully work in the United States, they would give the employer an opportunity—and the employee—to cure that in case there is misinformation in the data, which gets better every time we use it, and it's very good.

Aside from that, the IRS would then rule: Sorry, the wages that you knowingly and willfully paid to someone who is unlawfully present in the United States are not a business expense. So wages come out of the schedule C, they go into the gross receipts column again, and show up as net income at the bottom. The IRS would apply a penalty and an interest against the unpaid taxes, plus the taxes, to that income, that net income.

The effect of this is it would turn your $10-an-hour illegal into about a $16-an-hour illegal. That makes it a business decision. It means as an employer you're going to wonder: What year will I be audited—this year or next year or the year after?

Well, it wouldn't be the end of the world if they audited you for a year, but it might be pretty expensive as those years accumulate up to 6 under the statute of limitations. So employers would look at that accumulating statute of limitations of 6 years and decide, I'm going to get to legal. I'm going to work my way through and clean up my workforce. That's a logical business decision.

The bill also requires the IRS to work in cooperation with the Social Security Administration and the Department of Homeland Security so that they exchange information for the purpose of enforcing U.S. law. Now, this isn't that hard, and it's not complicated. It just takes the will. It takes a decent respect for the opinions of our Founding Fathers, the opinions of those who have written law before us and some who serve in this Congress today, a decent respect for the Constitution.

Let's reconstruct this respect for the rule of law in this country, Mr. Speaker. Let's reestablish its enforcement. Let's do so while we respect the dignity of every human person. Understand that they don't always get the clearest message in the country that they live in. They know they want to leave there. They know they want to come to America. They want to leave for some reason, such as perhaps it's too violent—58,000 people, some say more, killed in the drug wars in Mexico in the last few years.

The rule of law doesn't apply down there the way it does here. People aren't always equally treated under the law. Sometimes they are shaken down by police officers. That hardly ever happens in this country in a significant way.

We have equal protection under the law in America. If you look at the statue of Lady Justice, who is standing there with the scales of justice in her hands, they are balanced—equal protection, balanced protection under the law. Most times, you will see Lady Justice blindfolded, because justice is blind. It needs to treat every human person equally under the law. People come here because they want that kind of protection. It is a component of American exceptionalism—the rule of law.

The Senate is poised to destroy the rule of law, and the House seems to be moving in that direction. I am very troubled, Mr. Speaker, as I watch one of the essential pillars—the rule of law—of American exceptionalism be attacked and start to crumble before my very eyes in this country.

The job the Founding Fathers had, the vision came from God that our rights come from God. They all wrote that, they all agreed with that. It's in the Declaration.

They put this concept together—inspired, I believe—the concept of a free people, a sovereign people—''We the People.'' They sold that to a large enough percentage of the population in the Thirteen Original Colonies that they supported the Declaration. They had to sell it.

It wasn't just, Thomas Jefferson went into a room, got out the quill, and wrote the Declaration—they were so impressed by the language in it they decided to embrace it and start a revolution. This was a cultural thing, it was an intellectual thing, it was a faith component. They put that together and they sold it to the people in the Thirteen Original Colonies, who fought a war to establish this country and then to ratify a Constitution.

Their job was a lot harder than ours, Mr. Speaker. Our job is to preserve, protect, and defend it. They had to conceive of it, argue for it, sell it to the people, put it down in words and parchment—the Declaration, fight the war and some give their lives to shape America to the great, great country that we are today.

Our job is to preserve and protect and defend this glorious destiny that is out ahead of us. We cannot shrink from it, we cannot trail in the dust our Constitution or the rule of law, no matter what our hearts say about having sympathy for groups of people that may or may not have had the say about whether they came here legally or not. That is what's here to be defended.

Next week, we are going to be very vigorously defending the rule of law. I'm going to seek to have Lincoln-Douglas style debates outside of these Chambers, outside of the Capitol building, on Wednesday at 9:00 in the morning. It will extend. We will take a 2-hour break over lunch and begin again at 2:00 in the afternoon, Mr. Speaker.

□ 1510

This is going to be designed so that reasonable people can have an open discussion just like Stephen Douglas and Abraham Lincoln did. Let's air this out before the public, and let's hear what the public has to say. In fact, if we can work it out, I want to hear from the public as well, Mr. Speaker. It will be a big week next week, and I'm looking forward to it.

We are called to this task. Let's not trail in the dust the golden hopes of humanity. We are the redoubt of Western civilization. If we can't protect the fortress of the rule of law and all of these pillars of American exceptionalism here, we can't look to Western Europe to save us or Australia to save us. We can look to them as allies. If our civilization is going to be

preserved, it's going to be here in the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

FREEDOMS ENDOWED BY OUR CREATOR

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MEADOWS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We are living in interesting times—it's purported to be a Chinese curse to live in interesting times—but when you see what is confronting this country, what is taking our liberties, what is threatening our way of life, it's clear we are on the front lines of either winning back or losing for all times the greatest freedoms ever given and secured for one group of people.

This is an extraordinary country, and it is because, just as our Founders pointed out repeatedly, they recognized that our rights are provided by our Creator; but just as any inheritance can be taken by those who are evil, greedy, power hungry, it must be defended or you lose it.

We have people who make no bones about the fact that they want to destroy our way of life, that they think the freedom afforded the American people leads to debauchery, leads to ways of life that are evil and wrong, and therefore they must destroy the freedoms which have provided people the chance to make wrong choices. Our Founders would prefer the freedoms and so would the people here.

Unfortunately, there are good people who believe that they are so much smarter and know better than everyone else, that, gee, since we're in Congress, we should tell people what they can do, how they can live, how they can make a living, whether they can make a living, or that we may just pay you to do nothing and to never reach your God-given potential.

Then, as we heard today, we had an amendment made by our friend on the Democratic side, Mr. POLIS, that would have required a new addition to the chaplain corps of every branch of the military. It would be a new addition to the chaplain corps for those who are nontheistic—or atheistic—for those who believe there is no God. I had no idea that people who do not believe that there is a God needed help and encouragement and support for their unbelief. Astounding.

If people truly are atheistic, why would they need help in remaining so?

Could it possibly be that, the more people look around, the more they see things like Ben Franklin did—80 years old—and, yes, he enjoyed what some people would call ''pleasures'' of different types when he represented us in France and represented us in England. He was a brilliant man, and the massive painting outside these halls shows him sitting front and center at the Constitutional Convention.

It was there at that Convention when he finally got recognized after they'd been there nearly 5 weeks. Some across the country are still mis-educating children, unfortunately, by telling them he was a deist, someone who believes there is something—some force, some thing, some deity—that created nature, that created all of mankind and all of the things in the universe, and if such deity or thing still exists, it, he, she never interferes with the ways of men. Obviously, you see Ben Franklin's own words, and you know that's not what he believed. When he was 80 years old—2 years or so away from meeting his Maker—he finally got recognized after all the yelling back and forth that was done there at the Convention, and someone noted that Washington looked relieved when Mr. Franklin sought attention or, as some at the Convention called him, ''Dr. Franklin.''

He pointed out during his remarks—and we know exactly what he pointed out because he wrote it in his own handwriting. People wanted a copy of what he said. Madison made notes, but Franklin wrote it out.

Among other things, he said:

> I have lived, sir, a long time, and the longer I live, the more convincing proofs I see of this truth—that God governs in the affairs of men. And if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice, is it probable that an empire can rise without His aid? We have been assured, sir, in the sacred writings—

He called it ''sacred'' by the way—

> that except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it.

He encouraged those at the Convention that he also believed, in his words, that without His concurring aid—he was talking about the same God, the same Lord he had just referenced—we shall succeed in our political building no better than the builders of Babel. We will be confounded by our local partial interests, and we, ourselves, shall become a byword down through the ages.

That was in 1787 that Franklin said those words, late June. Now here we are, all these years later since 1787, and we have a motion to create chaplains in the military to help people not believe in what Ben Franklin said was the God who governs in the affairs of men, generically speaking. But it is important that people have the freedom to choose what they believe. As the Founders believed that God gave us freedom of choice, that He—our Creator—gave us those rights, they also believed that people should have the chance to choose right or wrong as well.

As an exchange student in the Soviet Union back in the seventies, I saw people and became very good friends with some college students who didn't have our rights, who envied our rights, who would love to have shared the rights that we have. Ultimately, we saw that play out a couple of decades later when many across the former Soviet Union demanded those rights. Of the 15 states that made up this socialist republic, some have gone back to those ways. I was intrigued that some are scared when they're given that much freedom to choose where they work.

□ 1520

Do you mean I've got to find a job? But I've never had to look for a job. It's a little scary. As so many Americans, particularly over the last 5 years, have found it can be very difficult to find a job. So the idea that the government may just tell you what your job is, tell you whether you get a chance to go to college or not, that sounds good. I don't have to think about those decisions. Let the government do it for us.

It's shocking, but there have grown to be many in America who like the idea of the government telling them what they can do, when they can do it, and how they can do it. It takes away the need to really wrestle with those things or, as so many of the signers of the Declaration believed, to have to pray about it and to struggle with the decision and try to find out, as many of them did, what is God's will for our lives.

We have a statue of Peter Muehlenberg from Pennsylvania that was just down the hall. But when the visitor center opened, he was moved. He is the Christian pastor who is depicted in the statue of taking off his ministerial robe as he preached from Ecclesiastes, There is a time for every purpose under Heaven. He also told his congregation, There is a time for peace and there is a time for war and now is the time for war. And he led men from his congregation to join the military and to fight for freedom.

His brother, Frederick, who also has a statue here, was the first Speaker of the House under our new Constitution. He had not actually immediately been in favor of the Revolution, but after his church was burned down by the British, he kind of thought maybe it was a decent idea for ministers to be involved in a revolution and for ministers to be involved in government where there was self-government of a people. So that brings us to today, from the Revolutionary years, to the Constitution after the Articles of Confederation fell apart.

Now, there was debate on Ben Franklin's proposal, because under the Continental Congress, they had had prayer every day to start their sessions. But the only way they could do that with the diverse Christian denominations, including the Quakers, was to agree on a minister that they believed would not offend the others and pay him to be the chaplain. But as they pointed out during the debate over Franklin's proposal, We don't have money. We're not getting paid. We're here for a constitutional convention, but we don't have money like we did in the Continental Congress. We can't hire a chaplain. But

once the Constitution was passed and ratified, from the time of the first Congress, that first day—actually, when George Washington was sworn in at the Federal building in New York, made his way down to the chapel that is still there—the only building that was unaffected at Ground Zero as the towers fell—they had a prayer session for the Nation. Then each Congress ever since, House and Senate, began each day with prayer before they ever begin their session. It's still true today. But, again today, we have the feeling that those who believe there's no God are insecure enough that they need somebody to encourage them in their unbelief.

One of the dangers, though, we have come to face and come to realize is that many in our Nation are choosing political correctness over safety. Yes, we all in this body, all of the Armed Forces when I was in the Army 4 years and we took that oath, we were supposed to support and protect the Constitution. Everybody I knew was prepared to die for it and to die for their country if necessary. Those people are still serving.

We found out, though, that if you get too involved in political correctness—and it's politically correct to look the other way when people are talking about hatred for America and wanting America to have the Constitution subordinated to shari'a law—that, gee, it's just politically correct not to face the facts that those people exist and that some of them are in the military. So they pass a man up the system so that he is there to counsel Christians, atheists, and others who need counseling.

With the people I've talked to in the military, especially in Afghanistan and when we were in Iraq, when you have a Commander in Chief who on his watch does not allow you to fire at people who may be firing at you, unless you can be sure you won't hit a civilian—at least that fear is put into those individuals. And I have asked for an official response from the Department of Defense, to put in writing exactly what our rules of engagement are that our soldiers are fighting under. We were told, That's classified and it can't be provided in answer to your question.

Well, somebody has passed it on to the military in harm's way, just like in August of 2011 when we had SEAL team members where a target was put on their backs by this administration when, first of all, the Vice President of the country violates the classified information laws and sets out in his speech who the commander was who brought down Osama bin Laden and about his great SEAL team.

Yes, he was paying them compliments, but he put a target on their back. I know our Vice President did not intend to do that. He was just so excited, just as he was when he revealed where the undisclosed location was. He didn't mean to breach national security. He was just happy and whatever he was to reveal those kind of things. But he put peoples's lives in danger.

One SEAL team member's father told me that right after the Vice President's speech, his daughter-in-law looked out the window. She had a marine guard out front. Karen and Billy Vaughn, they talk about how Aaron called them part of SEAL Team Six after they were outed. And it's been printed in the media that Leon Panetta, as a Cabinet member, was meeting with people who could receive the classified information.

But this administration wanted all the kudos they could get before the election, of course, and so they had producers of what I thought was a pretty good movie, ''Zero Dark Thirty,'' and gave them classified information and told them who took out Osama bin Laden. But in August of 2011, our SEAL team members paid the ultimate price of this administration's carelessness. They paid with their lives.

It would be nice to have it out where we could talk about it as a Nation, just exactly what the rules of engagement are that our military are dying under. Because there was a C–130 gun ship there—and this was not from some classified source. I got it because it was information that was given to the family members, although the military may not have known what they gave. There's testimony from the C–130 gun ship, a pilot and others, that they saw this group moving like a military group. They were not allowed to take them out. They even saw them shoot down our Chinook and kill our Americans, but there was a chance they might have hit civilians if they had killed the people that took down our SEAL Team Six members. So they couldn't even kill them after they killed our people.

We need to know what the rules of engagement are. We need to address the political correctness that is blinding our agencies and blinding our military of its ability to see who the enemy is, because it's getting people killed in harm's way.

□ 1530

When you refuse to acknowledge that the Afghans you're training may be willing to turn the guns you've trained them on and kill you, just as an Aggie friend had happen here recently in Afghanistan, what they call a ''green on blue killing,'' until we recognize that and recognize who our enemy is, and that our enemy may be among us and that our enemy can be in uniforms that we're supposed to be friendly with, then more Americans are going to be killed needlessly.

And when the political correctness of the FBI and the Justice Department and the State Department, intelligence department, for that matter, is that you've got to leave mosques alone where people are being radicalized, and even though there were sting operations that identified people who were radicalizing Americans before this administration changed the policy and they had to get friendly and reach out and partner, as the FBI said it originally did with CAIR, the Council on American-Islamic Relations, even though they've said they're not partnering with them, anytime CAIR says this offends us, then the FBI says, oh, gee, we better change it.

When you've had the Fifth Circuit of the United States Court of Appeals confirm that, yes, the evidence shows that CAIR and Islamic Society of North America, those are front organizations for the Muslim Brotherhood. They want shari'a law to be the law of the land, not our Constitution. And that is what we did not take an oath to allow to happen. We took an oath to the Constitution, and that means no law shall be above our Constitution.

And so that brings me also to the conversation, the question and answer with the FBI Director this week. I have a great deal of respect for him. He has been a patriot. He fought in Vietnam. He's a warrior. He cares about the country, but he has done great damage to the FBI. He instituted an administrative policy that has caused thousands and thousands of years of experience to leave the FBI and say, Under the new policy, I have to leave.

So you have very willing, able young FBI people who are in charge, but they have not benefited from the years of experience that others who had to leave had. I think that contributes to some of the problems that we see with our rights being protected, that we see with poor investigations. They just have not been the beneficiary of enough years of experience, and they've been taught by a lexicon, a language that does not allow them to talk about or see our enemy.

I've been making the point for months that the Boston massacre had clear potential to be completely avoided. And then we find out Russia gave our administration information to say the older Tsarnaev brother has been radicalized and he's going to kill people; you better look into it. Then all we've heard since the Russian bombing from this administration is the Russians should have given us more information.

Now, I grew to know a little bit about the way they think, and I don't entirely appreciate some of it, but I appreciate this: if they give information that says this person is going to kill Americans, understand we really don't care whether they kill Americans, but we would like for you to recognize that these are the kinds of people that will take out your government and will take out our government, and we'd like you to look into it. There's a mutual concern.

And when they put our government on notice and the reaction of our government is, well, we did some interviews. We looked into it. We didn't find anything.

The Russians: Are you kidding us? We hand you somebody who is going to kill Americans, and you can't find anything? What's wrong with you?

There's a great article, and I used it in questioning our FBI Director. It is entitled, ''Obama's Snooping Excludes Mosques, Missed Boston Bombers.''

It says:

Since October 2011, mosques have been off-limits to FBI agents. No more surveillance or undercover sting operations without high-level approval from a special oversight body at the Justice Department dubbed the Sensitive Operations Review Committee.

Who makes up this body, and how do they decide requests? Nobody knows; the names of chairman, members and staff are kept secret.

The FBI Director did not want to provide those as well.

So the FBI Director, as I pointed out to him here before I asked the question, I pointed out that according to this article, the Bureau did not even contact mosque leaders for help in identifying the Boston bombers' images after those images were captured on closed-circuit TV cameras and cell phones. The FBI Director attempted to correct me. He said, You said facts that aren't true. In fact, he said, Your facts are not all together—and I understood him to say not true, and so I demanded that he point out specifically what facts were wrong.

And he said, We went to the mosque prior to Boston. We said we went to the mosque prior to the Boston happening. We were in that mosque talking to imams several months beforehand. I couldn't during the questioning hear what he said at the end. What he said at the end, It was part of our outreach efforts.

If I'd heard that, I would have known and could have followed up and said, Wait a minute, that was part of your outreach effort to a Muslim mosque? It was not to follow up on the Tsarnaevs. And then, knowing that he had not properly followed up, knowing the FBI did not properly follow up with the mosque, I then asked about the mosque that was started, there are a couple of them, started by the Islamic Society of Boston, and were you aware that a founder was al Amoudi, because our Director knows who al Amoudi is. The FBI arrested him in 2003 or 2004 at Dulles Airport, as they could have done with al-Awlaki, who was killed by a drone bomb, as ordered by our President, that caused a lot of folks on both sides of the aisle to say, wait a minute, is that a good idea to kill American citizens without a trial?

And why is he an American citizen? Well, he's an American citizen because we have a policy, and a misinterpretation I would submit of the 14th Amendment, that if someone comes here on a visa and has a baby, then they're American citizens. So al-Awlaki's family was free to come in on a visa for college and then take him back to Yemen and radicalize him so that he hated America, and then he could come back here, and as he did, lead prayers here on Capitol Hill with congressional Muslim staffers and also have contact with people in the administration.

But I guess we won't ever know who all he had contact with because they blew him up while he was in Yemen. But he was free to come and go and radicalize people in America because he was an American citizen because his father and mother got a visa to come in here where he was born.

Al Amoudi was free to come and go here in the United States; that was until he was arrested at Dulles Airport and was tried and convicted and is doing over 20 years in Federal prison for supporting terrorism. And our FBI Director said at the hearing, he kind of had his head down and said it quietly, but he said it, no, he was not even aware that al Amoudi in prison for supporting terrorism was one of the founders. In fact, he is the one listed on the articles of organization for Massachusetts for the Islamic Society of Boston that started this. He didn't even know that.

Until we get past this political correctness so that we can see our enemies, see those who want to destroy our way of life and subjugate our Constitution to their ideas, then we are not protected, and we've got to get over that.

How about that? When Director Mueller testified before, he said, Oh, yeah, we have these great outreach programs to the Muslims. So apparently this is a part of it. I asked how is the outreach program going for groups like Christians and Catholics, Jewish, Buddhists, I forget who all I named.

□ 1540

But anyway, it was interesting, there's no such outreach group specifically for them, but there is a specific outreach group that didn't want to offend people who are radicalizing and being radicalized.

So it is pretty clear, we need to protect our borders from people who want to come in to destroy us, all avenues of entry. We need to deport those who overstay their visas. We need to reform our immigration service and our immigration process so that it is more effective, more efficient, and gives people proper answers more quickly.

We must stop allowing members of terrorist groups to consult with this President or his administration. We must stop discarding our allies who have fought with us and for us and throwing them under figurative buses.

We've got to stop rewarding our enemies so that when they say they want to destroy us, that we're our enemy, we don't send them $1.3 billion and tanks and jet planes.

And then, also, we have got to educate our Federal protection agencies on whom the enemy truly is.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

WASTEFUL SPENDING ON PRESIDENT OBAMA'S UPCOMING TRIP TO AFRICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING) for 30 minutes.

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, in a time when many Americans are out of work and struggling to make ends meet, the last thing that they want to see is tens of millions of their taxpayer dollars being spent to send the President on a trip to Africa.

Mr. Speaker, while every President deserves appropriate protective detail, the security provisions for President Obama's upcoming trip are excessive. Hundreds of Secret Service agents, over 50 vehicles, fighter jets, and a Navy aircraft carrier with a fully staffed medical trauma center will cost the government tens of millions of dollars.

Mr. Speaker, our country is over $16 trillion in debt, and the government agencies have made cutbacks as a result of the sequester. It is no secret that we need to rein in government spending, and the Obama administration has regularly and repeatedly shown a lack of judgment for when and where to make cuts.

For example, why should pilots' hours, Air Force pilots' hours, be cut back at Seymour Johnson Air Force Base so that the President can now have his most expensive trip since taking office?

Mr. Speaker, the fact is that the President's upcoming trip to Africa is going to be for less than 1 week, and that trip costs 1,350 times more than a week of White House tours. So for the cost of this trip to Africa, you could have 1,350 weeks of White House tours, which the White House has canceled indefinitely due to budget restraints.

Mr. Speaker, the numbers don't lie. So either the administration is bad at math, or they simply don't see a problem with their excessive spending.

The American people have had enough of the frivolous and careless spending; and they deserve real, appropriate cuts from this excessive administration.

I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. POE of Texas (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of personal reasons.

Ms. EDWARDS (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of a family funeral.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 17, 2013, at noon for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1864. A letter from the Secretary, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Procedures to Establish Appropriate Minimum Block Sizes for Large Notional Off-Facility Swaps and Block Trades (RIN: 3038-AD08) received June 3, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1865. A letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Unincorporated Business Entities (RIN: 3052-AC65) received June 7, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1866. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Incentives for Nondiscriminatory Wellness Programs in Group Health Plans (RIN: 1210-AB55) received June 3, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1867. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the 2012 National Healthcare Quality Report and the 2012 National Healthcare Disparities Report; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1868. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Incentives for Nondiscriminatory Wellness Programs in Group Health Plans [CMS-9979-F] (RIN: 0938-AR48) received June 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1869. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Filing, Indexing and Service Requirements for Oil Pipelines [Docket No.: RM12-15-000; Order No. 780] received June 4, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1870. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Reliability Standards for Geomagnetic Disturbances [Docket No.: RM12-22-000; Order No. 779] received June 7, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1871. A letter from the Assistant Secretary For Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Implementation of the Understandings Reached at the 2012 Australia Group (AG) Plenary Meeting and the 2012 AG Intersessional Decisions; Changes to Select Agent Controls [Docket No.: 120806310-2310-01] (RIN: 0694-AF76) received June 3, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1872. A letter from the Assistant Secretary For Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Addition, Removals, and Revisions to the List of Validated End-Users in the People's Republic of China [Docket No.: 130521487-3487-01] (RIN: 0694-AF92) received June 3, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1873. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Garnishment of Accounts Containing Federal Benefit Payments (RIN: 1505-AC20) received June 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1874. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Prevailing Rate Systems; Redefinition of the Clayton-Cobb-Fulton, Georgia, Nonappropriated Fund Federal Wage System Wage Area (RIN: 3206-AM84) received June 6, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1875. A letter from the Senior Vice President and Chief Financial Officer, Potomac Electric Power Company, transmitting the Balance Sheet of Potomac Electric Power Company as of December 31, 2012; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1797. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 113–109, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform discharged from further consideration. H.R. 1797 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BROUN of Georgia (for himself, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. LONG):

H.R. 2373. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide individual and corporate income tax relief and to extend 100 percent bonus depreciation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. WAGNER:

H.R. 2374. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to provide protections for retail customers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. BRALEY of Iowa):

H.R. 2375. A bill to delay for at least 6 months the implementation of round 1 recompete and round 2 of the Medicare durable medical equipment (DME) competitive bidding program and of the national mail order program for diabetic testing supplies to permit Congress an opportunity to reform the competitive bidding program, to provide for an evaluation of that program by an auction expert team, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 2376. A bill to implement a demonstration project under titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to examine the costs and benefits of providing payments for comprehensive coordinated health care services provided by purpose-built, continuing care retirement communities to Medicare beneficiaries; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DENHAM (for himself, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. NUNES, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. WALZ, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. FARR, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. GABBARD, and Mr. VALADAO):

H.R. 2377. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the enlistment in the Armed Forces of certain aliens who are unlawfully present in the United States and were younger than 15 years of age when they initially entered the United States, but who are otherwise qualified for enlistment, and to provide a mechanism by which such aliens, by reason of their honorable service in the Armed Forces, may be lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MULLIN (for himself, Mr. BUCSHON, and Mr. O'ROURKE):

H.R. 2378. A bill to reauthorize the Impact Aid Program under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BACHUS (for himself, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California):

H.R. 2379. A bill to amend the S.A.F.E. Mortgage Licensing Act of 2008 to permit a transitional period of 90 days for completion of requirements for qualified registered mortgage loan originators; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 2380. A bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 to repeal the market access program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 2381. A bill to provide for youth jobs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. COOK (for himself and Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD):

H.R. 2382. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish a priority for the Secretary of Veterans Affairs in processing certain claims for compensation; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois (for himself, Mr. CLAY, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. ENYART, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. LONG, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. HULTGREN, and Mr. ROSKAM):

H.R. 2383. A bill to designate the new Interstate Route 70 bridge over the Mississippi River connecting St. Louis, Missouri, and southwestern Illinois as the ''Stan Musial Veterans Memorial Bridge''; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. DEUTCH (for himself, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. MOORE, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. WATERS, Ms. MCCOLLUM,

Ms. CLARKE, Mr. NADLER, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. TITUS, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. VELA, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. GALLEGO):

H.R. 2384. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to require that supplemental nutrition assistance program benefits be calculated with reference to the cost of the low-cost food plan as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 2385. A bill to amend the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act to set the rate of pay for employees of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection in accordance with the General Schedule; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut (for himself, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. HIMES, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Mr. ANDREWS):

H.R. 2386. A bill to amend title 4, United States Code, to provide for the flying of the flag at half-staff in the event of the death of a first responder in the line of duty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. GRIMM):

H.R. 2387. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Rabbi Arthur Schneier in recognition of his pioneering role in promoting religious freedom and human rights throughout the world, for close to half a century; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MCCLINTOCK:

H.R. 2388. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to take certain Federal lands located in El Dorado County, California, into trust for the benefit of the Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MEADOWS (for himself, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. JONES, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. SALMON, and Mr. YOHO):

H.R. 2389. A bill to require the Inspector General for Tax Administration to audit the Internal Revenue Service; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Education and the Workforce, the Judiciary, Natural Resources, and House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia):

H.R. 2390. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for limitations on detentions of certain individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, and Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. WAGNER (for herself, Mr. CLAY, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. LONG, and Mr. SMITH of Missouri):

H.R. 2391. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 5323 Highway N in Cottleville, Missouri as the ''Lance Corporal Phillip Vinnedge Post Office''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. SMITH of Missouri:

H.J. Res. 49. A joint resolution proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOHO (for himself, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. LAMALFA, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. RADEL, Mr. SCHRADER, Mrs. ROBY, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H. Con. Res. 39. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that all direct and indirect subsidies that benefit the production or export of sugar by all major sugar producing and consuming countries should be eliminated; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. LOBIONDO, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Mr. GRIMM):

H. Res. 262. A resolution calling for the immediate extradition or rendering to the United States of convicted felon William Morales and all other fugitives from justice who are receiving safe harbor in Cuba in order to escape prosecution or confinement for criminal offenses committed in the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PITTS (for himself, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. TERRY, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. JONES, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. LATTA):

H. Res. 263. A resolution recognizing the immeasurable contributions of fathers in the healthy development of children, supporting responsible fatherhood, and encouraging greater involvement of fathers in the lives of their children, especially on Father's Day; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

46. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Maine, relative to a Joint Resolution requesting the enactment of legislation that would reinstate the separation of commercial and investment banking functions that was in effect under the Glass-Steagall Act; to the Committee on Financial Services.

47. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Tennessee, relative to House Joint Resolution No. 69 urging the Congress to classify emergency medical service providers as it does other first responders; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

48. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Maine, relative to a Joint Resolution honoring the Victims of the Boston Marathon Explosions; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

49. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Nevada, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 1 supporting the preservation and protection of our iconic wild horses and burros in the State of Nevada; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

50. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Nevada, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 14 urging the Congress to enact the Lyon County Economic Development and Conservation Act; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

51. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, relative to Concurrent Resolution No. 24 requesting the Congress to provide $2.5 million for the State Elections Commission of Puerto Rico for a congressionally-sponsored plebiscite; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

52. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Maine, relative to a Joint Resolution supporting an amendment to the Constitution regarding campaign finance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey introduced a bill (H.R. 2392) for the relief of certain aliens who were aboard the Golden Venture; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. BROUN of Georgia:

H.R. 2373.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mrs. WAGNER:

H.R. 2374.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution: ''The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.''

Additional authority derives from Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution: ''To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.''

Additional authority derives from Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution: ''To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.''

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2375.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3; and including, but not solely limited to Article I, Section 8, Clause 14.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 2376.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DENHAM:

H.R. 2377.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional Authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution (clauses 12, 13, 14, 16, and 18), which grants Congress the power to raise and support an Army; to provide and maintain a Navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia; and to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the foregoing powers.

By Mr. MULLIN:

H.R. 2378.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Article I, Section 8

By Mr. BACHUS:

H.R. 2379.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 2380.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority delegated to Congress to enact this legislation is found in Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution, which authorizes Congress to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 2381.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

''The Constitution of the United States,'' Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. COOK:

H.R. 2382.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 2383.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. DEUTCH:

H.R. 2384.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 2385.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution: ''To regulate Commerce with foreign nations, and among several States, and with the Indian Tribes.''

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution: ''To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.''

Explanation: To the extent that the CFPB falls under the purview of Congress' power to regulate commerce, legislation that is reasonably deemed as an appropriate or necessary means to achieve such ends is constitutional under the necessary and proper clause. Legislation that seeks to classify and compensate federal employees at the CFPB is a practical means to effectively execute the power granted to Congress to regulate Commerce.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:

H.R. 2386.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 2387.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 5 of the U.S. Constitution: ''To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures;''.

By Mr. MCCLINTOCK:

H.R. 2388.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

(1) U.S. Constitution, Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (the Property Clause), which confers on Congress the authority over lands belonging to the United States, including the placement of such lands into trust for Native American Tribes.

(2) U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (the Commerce Clause) and U.S. Constitution, Article II, Section 2 (the Treaty Clause), which confer on Congress plenary authority over Native American affairs.

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 2389.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1, Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution which reads: ''The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the Debts, and provide for the common Defense and General Welfare of the United States; but all Duties and Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.''

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 2390.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 8, Clauses 10, 11, and 18.

By Mrs. WAGNER:

H.R. 2391.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution, which grants Congress the power to establish Post Offices and post Roads, Congress has the authority to enact legislation to name a post office.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 2392.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 4 of the Constitution provides that Congress shall have power ''To establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States;''

By Mr. SMITH of Missouri:

H.J. Res. 49.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V of the U.S. Constitution, which grants Congress the authority to propose Constitutional amendments.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 24: Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 32: Mr. GIBSON, Mr. VEASEY, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 36: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. LATHAM, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, and Mr. ROSKAM.

H.R. 129: Mrs. LUMMIS.

H.R. 198: Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 207: Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 274: Mr. PAYNE, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 358: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.

H.R. 359: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 400: Ms. SPEIER and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 451: Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 474: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 485: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 508: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.

H.R. 543: Ms. ESTY.

H.R. 580: Mr. PERRY.

H.R. 594: Mr. MATHESON.

H.R. 596: Mr. TAKANO and Mr. LABRADOR.

H.R. 647: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 664: Ms. BASS.

H.R. 690: Mr. BARBER and Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 693: Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. JOYCE, and Mr. GOHMERT.

H.R. 698: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.

H.R. 721: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.

H.R. 750: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. MATHESON, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 755: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CLAY, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. GARCIA, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. PETERS of California, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. VELA, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. MCINTYRE.

H.R. 762: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 763: Mr. BRIDENSTINE and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

H.R. 794: Mr. HANNA and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 846: Mr. BONNER, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mrs. ROBY.

H.R. 847: Mr. MCDERMOTT and Ms. BASS.

H.R. 851: Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 920: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.

H.R. 924: Mr. RANGEL and Ms. SCHWARTZ.

H.R. 952: Ms. SHEA-PORTER and Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 956: Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 961: Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 1024: Mr. PITTENGER.

H.R. 1077: Mr. VELA.

H.R. 1078: Mr. ALEXANDER.

H.R. 1093: Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 1102: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 1148: Mr. POLIS and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 1179: Mr. CLAY, Ms. MENG, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. BARBER.

H.R. 1186: Mr. ISSA and Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 1199: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

H.R. 1226: Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. MCHENRY, and Mr. LUCAS.

H.R. 1250: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 1252: Mrs. WALORSKI.

H.R. 1254: Mr. COBLE, Mr. ROSS, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. PITTS, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mrs. ELLMERS.

H.R. 1303: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 1354: Ms. GRANGER and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 1373: Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 1403: Ms. CLARKE.

H.R. 1428: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan and Mrs. CAPITO.

H.R. 1494: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 1523: Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 1530: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 1563: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.
H.R. 1599: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.
H.R. 1627: Mr. MARKEY and Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 1692: Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 1717: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. CASSIDY.
H.R. 1750: Mr. COLE, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. WHITFIELD, and Mrs. NOEM.
H.R. 1779: Mr. HARPER, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. ROSS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. BARR, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. HURT, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 1791: Mr. PALAZZO.
H.R. 1795: Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. BURGESS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. HIMES, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. GRIMM.
H.R. 1797: Mr. HURT.
H.R. 1806: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 1827: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 1830: Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 1837: Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. WELCH, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 1838: Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. MICHAUD, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 1843: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 1874: Mr. MESSER.
H.R. 1878: Mr. BUCSHON.
H.R. 1891: Ms. KUSTER, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 1907: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 1908: Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. LABRADOR, and Mr. AMASH.
H.R. 1918: Mr. AMODEI and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.
H.R. 1961: Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 2000: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 2002: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
H.R. 2003: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 2009: Mr. DUFFY, Mr. LATHAM, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 2016: Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 2019: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. BONNER, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GOWDY, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia.
H.R. 2026: Mr. HARPER, Mr. LABRADOR, and Mr. REICHERT.
H.R. 2045: Mr. WEBER of Texas and Mr. DESJARLAIS.
H.R. 2051: Ms. BASS, Mr. RUSH, and Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 2053: Mr. YODER.
H.R. 2068: Mr. LABRADOR.
H.R. 2084: Mr. WHITFIELD.
H.R. 2088: Mr. O'ROURKE.
H.R. 2156: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
H.R. 2185: Mr. KEATING.
H.R. 2201: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 2203: Mr. PRICE of Georgia and Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 2231: Mr. MULLIN.
H.R. 2241: Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 2247: Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 2250: Mr. PETERSON and Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 2258: Mr. GOHMERT.
H.R. 2273: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 2278: Mr. MARINO.
H.R. 2288: Ms. NORTON, Mr. MORAN, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. SPEIER, and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 2300: Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. CRAWFORD, and Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.
H.R. 2310: Mr. STEWART.
H.R. 2313: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H.R. 2323: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
H.R. 2324: Mr. ROONEY, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mr. NOLAN.
H.R. 2328: Mr. LANCE, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. SCHOCK.
H.R. 2330: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
H.R. 2353: Mr. KIND, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Ms. MOORE, Mr. DUFFY, and Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 2360: Mr. DENT.
H. Con. Res. 16: Ms. JENKINS.
H. Con. Res. 24: Mr. HARRIS and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H. Con. Res. 28: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. POLIS, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. KIND.
H. Con. Res. 36: Mr. POCAN.
H. Res. 30: Mr. TIERNEY.
H. Res. 72: Mr. SCHOCK.
H. Res. 109: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H. Res. 170: Mr. MESSER.
H. Res. 188: Mr. WOLF.
H. Res. 199: Mr. LATHAM.
H. Res. 206: Mrs. BLACK.
H. Res. 213: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H. Res. 222: Mr. COTTON, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. RADEL, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. NUNNELEE.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

24. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Chemung County Legislature, New York, relative to Resolution No. 13-244 opposing any effort by the Congress to amend Section 922 of Title 18, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

25. Also, a petition of the City of Berkeley, California, relative to Resolution No. 66, 102-N.S. supporting the passage of the United American Families Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XV, the following discharge petition was filed:

Petition 2, June 13, 2013, by Mr. JOE COURTNEY on H.R. 1595, was signed by the following members: Joe Courtney, Ron Barber, Tony Cárdenas, Mike Thompson, Gerald E. Connolly, Terri A. Sewell, John B. Larson, James P. McGovern, Marcy Kaptur, Elizabeth H. Esty, David N. Cicilline, Lois Capps, Janice Hahn, Julia Brownley, Eddie Bernice Johnson, Scott H. Peters, Brian Higgins, George Miller, Sander M. Levin, Alcee L. Hastings, Filemon Vela, Gene Green, Robert E. Andrews, William R. Keating, Grace Meng, John D. Dingell, Ann M. Kuster, Joaquin Castro, Bill Pascrell Jr., Hakeem S. Jeffries, Timothy H. Bishop, Daniel T. Kildee, Mike Quigley, Danny K. Davis, G.K. Butterfield, Lucille Roybal-Allard, Al Green, Yvette D. Clarke, Wm. Lacy Clay, Marcia L. Fudge, André Carson, Gloria Negrete McLeod, Timothy J. Walz, Kathy Castor, Michael E. Capuano, Joseph P. Kennedy III, John Garamendi, Suzan K. DelBene, Denny Heck, Pete P. Gallego, John F. Tierney, Raúl M. Grijalva, Ann Kirkpatrick, James P. Moran, David Scott, Michelle Lujan Grisham, Frank Pallone, Jr., Suzanne Bonamici, Robin L. Kelly, Tammy Duckworth, Michael M. Honda, Sanford D. Bishop Jr., Henry Cuellar, William L. Enyart, Derek Kilmer, Jared Huffman, Rush Holt, Mark Pocan, Matt Cartwright, Jared Polis, Daniel Lipinski, Beto O'Rourke, Rubén Hinojosa, Henry A. Waxman, Frederica S. Wilson, Colleen W. Hanabusa, Dina Titus, Eric Swalwell, Linda T. Sánchez, Chellie Pingree, Bill Foster, Adam B. Schiff, Debbie Wasserman Schultz, Grace F. Napolitano, Eliot L. Engel, David Loebsack, Raul Ruiz, James R. Langevin, Karen Bass, Mike McIntyre, Lois Frankel, Diana DeGette, Theodore E. Deutch, C.A. Dutch Ruppersberger, Rosa L. DeLauro, Chris Van Hollen, Jim Costa, Michael F. Doyle, Betty McCollum, Sheila Jackson Lee, Doris O. Matsui, Anna G. Eshoo, Donna F. Edwards, James E. Clyburn, Niki Tsongas, Mark Takano, Kyrsten Sinema, Steven A. Horsford, Melvin L. Watt, Juan Vargas, David E. Price, Albio Sires, Ami Bera, Alan S. Lowenthal, Nydia M. Velázquez, Maxine Waters, Jim McDermott, Cheri Bustos, Peter Welch, Allyson Y. Schwartz, John C. Carney Jr., John P. Sarbanes, Sam Farr, Cedric L. Richmond, Jerry McNerney, José E. Serrano, Donald M. Payne Jr., Gary C. Peters, Bennie G. Thompson, Richard M. Nolan, Joe Garcia, James A. Himes, Sean Patrick Maloney, Keith Ellison, Joyce Beatty, Zoe Lofgren, Peter A. DeFazio, Emanuel Cleaver, Elijah E. Cummings, Ed Perlmutter, Bradley S. Schneider, John A. Yarmuth, Gregory W. Meeks, Earl Blumenauer, Steve Israel, Louise McIntosh Slaughter, Robert C. ''Bobby'' Scott, Paul Tonko, Janice D. Schakowksy, Brad Sherman, Joseph Crowley, Ed Pastor, Loretta Sanchez, Adam Smith, Nick J. Rahall II, Bruce L. Braley, William L. Owens, Steve Cohen, Steny H. Hoyer, Luis V. Gutierrez, Gwen Moore, Corrine Brown, Xavier Becerra, Robert A. Brady, Ben Ray Luján, Daniel B. Maffei, Alan Grayson, Henry C. ''Hank'' Johnson Jr., Stephen F. Lynch, Chaka Fattah, Nancy Pelosi, Jackie Speier, Nita M. Lowey, Jerrold Nadler, Patrick Murphy, John K. Delaney, Tim Ryan, Rick Larsen, John Lewis, Carolyn B. Maloney, Collin C. Peterson, Kurt Schrader, Michael H. Michaud, Charles B. Rangel, Tulsi Gabbard, and Susan A. Davis.